80-1340

No.

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 6 1981
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1980

The Honorable RICHARD D. LAMM, Governor of the State of Colorado; JAMES G. RICKETTS, Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Corrections; JOHN PERKO, Director of Adult Services of the Colorado Department of Corrections; EDGAR FOX, Director of the Division of Correctional Industries of the Colorado Department of Corrections; and WILLIAM WILSON, Superintendent of the Canon Correctional Facility,

Petitioners,

v.

FIDEL RAMOS, DAVID LEE ANDERSON, SADIKI LISIMBA AJAMU, (a/k/a Eugene Collins), ALEXANDER ROSES, MARK J. MENCHETTI, LESTER LASENBY,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

J.D. MacFARLANE
Attorney General

RICHARD F. HENNESSEY
Deputy Attorney General

MARY J. MULLARKEY
Solicitor General

DAVID K. REES
Assistant Attorney General
Litigation Section
Counsel of Record

Attorneys for Petitioners

1525 Sherman Street, 3rd Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203
Telephone: 839-3611

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Was the federal court required to abstain in a "totality of conditions" prison suit when confronted with a state defendant which, prior to initiation of this lawsuit, had voluntarily addressed the problems at its maximum security prison and had moved forcefully and quickly to remedy those problems?

2. What is the proper standard by which to measure the state's obligations under the eighth amendment in a "totality of conditions" prison suit? In particular, did the Tenth Circuit err in finding liability against the State of Colorado on the basis that a prisoner is entitled to be confined in an environment which does not result in his degeneration or which threatens his mental and physical well being?

PARTIES

The names of all parties to this proceeding are listed in the caption of the case. It should be noted, however, that in the court of appeals eighteen states and one territory joined the State of Colorado as *amici curiae:* Alaska, American Samoa, Arizona, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Nebraska, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah, Washington and Wyoming.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW i

PARTIES ii

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 1

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF GRANTING CERTIORARI 4

A. Absention 4

B. The Constitutional Standard 9

CONCLUSION 21

APPENDICES

1. The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit in *Ramos* v. *Lamm*, No. 79-2324 (Sept. 25, 1980), *as modified*, Nov. 10, 1980. ..... A-1

2. The opinion of the United States District Court for the District of Colorado reported as *Ramos* v. *Lamm*, 485 F. Supp. 122 (D. Colo. 1979). A-51

3. The judgment of the United States Court of Appeals. A-133

4. The order denying the parties' petitions for rehearing dated Nov. 10, 1980. ..... A-137

5. Defendants' exhibit 1137, memorandum from the Colorado Legislative Council staff to Senator Ralph Cole re: Chronology of events concerning construction projects at the various correctional facilities (without attachments). A-143

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Page

Battle v. Anderson, 376 F. Supp. 402 (E.D. Okla. 1974) 6

Battle v. Anderson, 447 F. Supp. 516 (E.D. Okla.), *aff'd*, 564 F.2d 388 (10th Cir. 1977) 6

Battle v. Anderson, 564 F.2d 388 (10th Cir. 1977) ... 6,11

Battle v. Anderson, 594 F.2d 786 (1979) 6

Battle v. Anderson, 614 F.2d 251 (10th Cir. 1980) ... 6

Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520 (1979) 3,9,10,11,12

Burford v. Sun Oil Co., 319 U.S. 315 (1943) 7

Capps v. Atiyeh, 495 F. Supp. 802 (1980) 11

Carey v. Sugar, 425 U.S. 73 (1976) 6

Colorado River Water Conservancy District v. United States, 424 U.S. 800 (1976) 7

Finney v. Hutto, 410 F. Supp. 251 (E.D. Ark. 1976), *aff'd*, 548 F.2d 740 (8th Cir. 1976), *aff'd*, 437 U.S. 678 (1978) 6

Gregory v. Wyse, 512 F.2d 378 (10th Cir. 1975) 2

Harris County Commissioners' Court v. Moore, 420 U.S. 77 (1975) 6

Hicks v. Miranda, 422 U.S. 322 (1975) 6

Hite v. Leeke, 564 F.2d 670 (4th Cir. 1977) 10

Holt v. Hutto, 363 F. Supp. 194 (E.D. Ark. 1973), *modified*, 505 F.2d 194 (8th Cir. 1974) 6

Holt v. Sarver, 300 F. Supp. 825 (E.D. Ark. 1969) . . . 6

Holt v. Sarver, 309 F. Supp. 362 (E.D. Ark. 1970), *aff'd*, 442 F.2d 304 (8th Cir. 1971) 6

Huffman v. Pursue, Ltd., 420 U.S. 592 (1975) 6

Hutto v. Finney, 437 U.S. 678 (1978) 5,6

Juidice v. Vail, 430 U.S. 327 (1977) 5,6

Moore v. Sims, 442 U.S. 415 (1979) 6

Newman v. Alabama, 559 F.2d 283 (5th Cir. 1977), *cert. denied*, 438 U.S. 915 (1978) 10,11,12

People v. McKenna, 611 P.2d 574 (Colo. 1980) 3

Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475 (1973) 6,7

Procunier v. Martinez, 416 U.S. 396 (1974) 6,9

Ramos v. Lamm, 485 F. Supp. 122 (D. Colo. 1979) . . 1,4,10

Stone v. Powell, 428 U.S. 465 (1976) 6

Trainor v. Hernandez, 431 U.S. 434 (1977) 6

Wesson v. Johnson, 195 Colo. 521, 579 P.2d 1165 (1978) 5

Wolfish v. Levi, 573 F.2d 118 (2nd Cir. 1978), *rev'd in part on other grounds, Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520 (1979) 10

Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37 (1971) 6

STATUTES

Page

1977 Colo. Sess. Laws ch. 216 at 861 3

1977 Colo. Sess. Laws ch. 223 at 901 3

28 U.S.C. section 1254(1) 1

28 U.S.C. sections 1331 and 1343(3) 3

42 U.S.C. section 1983 3

RULES

Page

Colo. R. Civ. P. 24(a) 5

Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b) 4

Sup. Ct. R. 19(c) 6

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Page

Bronstien, *Reform Without Change: The Future of Prisoners' Rights,* 4 Civil Liberties Rev. No. 3 27 (1977) 8

Comment, *The Role of the Eighth Amendment in Prison Reform,* 38 U. Chi. L. Rev. 647 (1971) 8

Feldberg, *Confronting Conditions of Confinement: An Expanded Role for Courts in Prison Reform,* 12 Harv. Civil Rights - Civil Liberties L. Rev. 367 (1977) 5,8

National Association of Attorneys General, *Implementation of Remedies in Prison Conditions Suits,* 49 (1980) 9

Note, *Decency and Fairness: An Emerging Judicial Role in Prison Reform,* 57 U. Va. L. Rev. 841 (1971) 8

Robbins, *Federalism, State Prison Reform, and Evolving Standards of Human Decency: On Guessing, Stressing, and Redressing Constitutional Rights,* 26 Kans. L. Rev. 551 (1978) 8

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals is not yet reported. A copy of this decision is included in the appendix to this petition (A-1). The opinion of the district court is reported as *Ramos v. Lamm*, 485 F. Supp. 122 (D. Colo. 1979) (A-51).

JURISDICTION

The decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit issued on September 25, 1980, at which time judgment entered (A-133). Following the filing of petitions for rehearing by both sides, the opinion was modified and the petitions for rehearing were denied on November 10, 1980 (A-137). The jurisdiction of this court is conferred by 28 U.S.C. section 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The eighth amendment to the United States Constitution states:

> Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Section one of the fourteenth amendment to the United States Constitution states:

> All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

42 U.S.C section 1983 states:

> Every person who, under color of any statute, ordi-

nance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In 1975, over two years before this suit was filed and in the same year that the worst cells at the state penitentiary were upheld as constitutional, *Gregory v. Wyse,* 512 F.2d 378 (10th Cir. 1975), the Attorney General of Colorado, J. D. MacFarlane, at the request of the Governor, conducted an investigation of conditions at the Colorado State Penitentiary. The Attorney General issued a report acknowledging, "With the exception of the new administration building, the prison is antiquated and shows the scars left by generations of neglect, the legacy of our society's past indifference to the fate of its prisoners." The report concluded that "the penitentiary is in trouble and decisive action is mandated now. The reforms are flatly overdue." (Plaintiffs' exhibit 3 at 30, 66.)

The Colorado legislature immediately addressed the problem of reforming the state's system of corrections. In 1976 and 1977 it appropriated over $10 million to build a new "close" security facility[1] and renovate existing structures. It also appropriated $200,000 in planning money for a new maximum security facility. The following year an additional $11.4 million were appropriated to build a new maximum security facility. The Centennial Correctional Facility (maximum security) opened on December 22, 1980. The Shadow Mountain Correctional Facility ("close" security) opened on January 26, 1981. (For a summary of the legislature's actions see defendants' exhibit 1137, A-143.) These facilities are state-of-the-art "modular" prisons designed by

---

[1] "Close security" is an intermediate designation between medium security and maximum security. Originally this building was intended to be a medium security facility.

Paul Silver, the architect of the Metropolitan Correctional Center discussed in *Bell v. Wolfish,* 441 U.S. 520 (1979).

The State of Colorado did far more than merely erect two new buildings; it restructured its entire system of corrections. The legislature established a new Division of Correctional Industries to combat idleness and teach job skills and elevated the Department of Corrections to a cabinet level agency. 1977 Colo. Sess. Laws ch. 223 at 903,927. Additionally, the legislature implemented a new system of sentencing, parole, and "good time" laws. *Id.* at 919; 1977 Colo. Sess. Laws ch. 216 at 861,867. See *People v. McKenna,* 611 P.2d 574 (Colo. 1980).

The Department of Corrections also began to implement new policies to effect reform. Dr. Allen Ault, a nationally recognized expert in the field of corrections, became Executive Director of the Department of Corrections in 1977. He immediately introduced new rules and regulations to insure inmate safety, adopted a new classification system (R. vol. 30 at 96), improved food and medical services (R. vol. 30 at 63), instituted a new diagnostic system (R. vol. 30 at 159), and broadened programs (R. vol. 37 at 78). The record is clear that long before this lawsuit was filed, the legislative and executive branches of government were, without judicial intervention, correcting the deficiencies in the state's system of corrections.

On November 30, 1977, Fidel Ramos filed a *pro se* complaint against certain state defendants regarding the conditions of his confinement at the Colorado State Penitentiary, now known as the Canon Correctional Facility (hereinafter CCF) (R. vol. 1 at 2). On January 16, 1978, the defendants (hereinafter the state) filed a motion to dismiss Mr. Ramos' complaint. This motion was denied on February 8, 1978 (R. vol. 1 at 8, 19).

On February 15, 1978, the National Prison Project and the A.C.L.U. Foundation of Colorado entered their appearances and, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1983 and 28 U.S.C. sections 1331 and 1343(3), filed a lengthy amended complaint, styled

as a class action, challenging the totality of conditions at CCF (R. vol. 1 at 30). On April 7, 1978, the state filed a motion to dismiss and/or abstain and stay proceedings (R. vol. 1 at 64). This motion was denied (R. vol. 10 at 34). At trial, the state again asked the court to abstain, but it again refused. (R. vol. 42 at 79, 84).

On December 20, 1979, the trial court filed a memorandum opinion and order and, the following day entered judgment against the state under Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b). In its order, the district court found that the totality of conditions at CCF was unconstitutional. 485 F. Supp. at 133 (A-62). As had the state several years earlier, the court recognized that many of the problems could not be remedied at the old prison, stating: "Every expert who has examined Old Max [CCF] has concluded that it would be both infeasible and uneconomical to renovate Old Max for continued use." 485 F. Supp. at 136 (A-68). The opinion added that because of the design of the old facility, adequate programs or security would be impossible. 485 F. Supp. 136-37, 141 (A-68, 69). Further, the level of health care at CCF was declared inadequate, as were the opportunities for access to the courts and visitation. The degree of idleness at the institution and the classification system utilized by the Department of Corrections were also held unconstitutional. 485 F. Supp. at 156-167 (A-105-108, 110-114). On December 28, 1979, the state filed its notice of appeal (R. vol. 6 at 1245).

On appeal, the Tenth Circuit held that the trial court did not err in refusing to abstain; affirmed the finding that the totality of conditions at CCF was unconstitutional; reversed the findings in the areas of idleness, classification, and visitation; vacated the remedial portions of the order except those portions relating to health; and remanded the case for further hearings (A-49). From this judgment the State of Colorado brings this petition for certiorari.

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF GRANTING CERTIORARI

A. ABSTENTION

This case is not the usual "prison conditions" lawsuit in which federal court action was a necessary last resort to

compel reformation of a state prison system. Here, the plaintiffs were latecomers in the process, not initiators of reform. This suit was filed long after the state had decided to replace its maximum security facility; after it had appropriated millions of dollars for the construction of two new prisons to be built according to the most modern prison architecture; and after it had made numerous changes in its prison programs and policies. Given these facts, the federal district court should have refused to hear a "totality of conditions" prison suit.[2]

When the state filed its motion to dismiss and/or abstain, two judicial doctrines came into direct conflict: the "totality of conditions" prison suit, which expanded the exercise of federal jurisdiction and the principle of abstention, which restricted it.

In the last decade the "totality of conditions" prison suit evolved in the federal courts. See Feldberg, *Confronting Conditions of Confinement: An Expanded Role for Courts in Prison Reform,* 12 Harv. Civil Rights - Civil Liberties L. Rev. 367 (1977) (hereinafter "Feldberg"). In such suits the courts do not look at any one particular prison practice but determine whether the overall conditions of confinement constitute cruel and unusual punishment. *Id.* at 369. A "totality of conditions" prison suit not only places the entire prison system on trial, but permits the plaintiffs, if they prevail on liability, to obtain remedial orders which put control of the prisons in the hands of the federal judiciary. *See, e.g., Hutto v. Finney,* 437 U.S. 678 (1978). Trials in such cases are extremely lengthy, require major resources to be

---

[2] Not only were the executive and legislative branches proceeding expeditiously, Colorado courts permitted plaintiffs to file actions in state court pursuant to 42 U.S.C. section 1983 to remedy unconstitutional prison conditions. *See Wesson v. Johnson,* 195 Colo. 521, 579 P.2d 1165 (1978). At the time the state argued its motion to dismiss and or abstain, there were at least two such pending actions concerning the penitentiary in which the plaintiffs could have intervened: *Duran v. Lamm,* Denver District Court, Civil Action No. 78-438 and *Morrison v. Lamm,* Denver District Court, Civil Action No. C-66722 (class action). See Colo. R. Civ. P. 24(a). Given the fact that state courts were available to the plaintiffs, abstention was required. *Juidice v. Vail,* 430 U.S. 327 (1977).

expended by the parties and the courts, and have remedial phases which last for years.[3]

At the same time the "totality of conditions" prison suit was developing, this Court decided a series of cases extending the doctrine of abstention — a doctrine which limits the exercise of federal jurisdiction.[4] The development of this doctrine has been consistent with the Court's general concern for the administration of the federal courts, and the relation between the federal and state courts in deciding federal questions. *See, e.g., Stone v. Powell,* 428 U.S. 465 (1976). While the Supreme Court has apparently given its approval to "totality of conditions" prison suits, *see Hutto v. Finney, supra,* at 681, it has never decided the issue of how the doctrine of abstention applies to them.[5] Because of the importance of this issue, it should now be resolved. See Sup. Ct. R. 19(c).

The prior decisions of the Supreme Court require reversal in this case. In *Preiser v. Rodriguez,* 411 U.S. 475, 491-92 (1973), this Court stated:

---

[3] The cases arising from Arkansas and Oklahoma provide excellent examples of the protracted nature of prison litigation. See *Holt v. Sarver,* 300 F. Supp. 825 (E.D. Ark. 1969); *Holt v. Sarver,* 309 F. Supp. 362 (E.D. Ark. 1970, *aff'd,* 442 F.2d 304 (8th Cir. 1971); *Holt v. Hutto,* 363 F. Supp. 194 (E.D. Ark. 1973), *modified,* 505 F.2d 194 (8th Cir. 1974); *Finney v. Hutto,* 410 F. Supp. 251 (E.D. Ark. 1976), *aff'd,* 548 F.2d 740 (8th Cir. 1976), *aff'd,* 437 U.S. 678 (1978). *See also, Battle v. Anderson,* 376 F. Supp. 402 (E.D. Okla. 1974), *Battle v. Anderson,* 447 F. Supp. 516 (E.D. Okla.), *aff'd,* 564 F.2d 388 (10th Cir. 1977); *Battle v. Anderson,* 594 F.2d 786 (1979) (an appeal of an unpublished district court opinion); *Battle v. Anderson,* 614 F.2d 251 (10th Cir. 1980) (remanding the case for still further proceedings).

[4] *See Younger v. Harris,* 401 U.S. 37 (1971); *Harris County Commissioners' Court v. Moore,* 420 U.S. 77 (1975); *Huffman v. Pursue, Ltd.,* 420 U.S. 592 (1975); *Hicks v. Miranda,* 422 U.S. 322 (1975); *Carey v. Sugar,* 425 U.S. 73 (1976); *Juidice v. Vail,* 430 U.S. 327 (1977); *Trainor v. Hernandez,* 431 U.S. 434 (1977); *Moore v. Sims,* 442 U.S. 415 (1979).

[5] *Compare, Procunier v. Martinez,* 416 U.S. 396 (1974), in which the Court held that abstention was not appropriate where the suit was brought solely to enforce first amendment rights.

> It is difficult to imagine an activity in which a State has a stronger interest, or one that is more intricately bound up with state laws, regulations, and procedures, than the administration of its prisons. . . . For state prisoners, eating, sleeping, dressing, washing, working, and playing are all done under the watchful eyes of the State, and so the possibilities for litigation under the Fourteenth Amendment are boundless. . . . Moreover, because most potential litigation involving state prisoners arises on a day-to-day basis, it is most efficiently and properly handled by the state administrative bodies and state courts which are, for the most part, familiar with the grievances of state prisoners and in a better physical and practical position to deal with those grievances. . . . *The strong considerations of comity that require giving a state court system that has convicted a defendant the first opportunity to correct its own errors thus also require giving the States the first opportunity to correct the errors made in the internal administration of their prisons.*

(emphasis added).

In *Colorado River Water Conservancy District v. United States,* 424 U.S. 800, 814 (1976), the Court held that abstention may be required where important matters of state policy are concerned, stating:

> It is enough that exercise of federal review of the question in a case and in similar cases would be disruptive of state efforts to establish a coherent policy with respect to a matter of substantial public concern.

See also, Burford v. Sun Oil Co., 319 U.S. 315 (1943). Read together, these decisions strongly support Colorado's position that abstention was required in this case. *Preiser* establishes that the state's interest in the administration of its prisons is of the highest order and mandates that it be given the first opportunity to remedy any errors. *Colorado River Water* establishes that where a matter is of substantial public concern, comity requires that the federal court refrain from disrupting the state's efforts to establish a coherent policy. Since the district court's failure to abstain has been

disruptive of the State of Colorado's efforts to establish a new system of corrections, abstention was required.

The potential for disruption of state systems of corrections is always present in "totality" suits because of their all-encompassing nature. Courts, however, have ignored the potential disruptive impact of such suits because they were seen as a necessary response to situations in which the legislative and the executive branches of government refused to devote resources to improving the living conditions of the incarcerated. Feldberg, *supra,* at 369. *See generally,* Comment, *The Role of the Eighth Amendment in Prison Reform,* 38 U. Chi. L. Rev. 647 (1971). Indeed, such suits are advocated precisely because they are likely to spur the executive and legislative branches to action.[6] Where, as here, government needs no prodding, the policy basis for "totality of conditions" prisons suits is utterly lacking.

The failure of the district court to abstain in a situation where the state was already reforming its own system of corrections has the ironic and disturbing effect of providing the states with a disincentive to voluntarily reform their own prisons. Much of the evidence introduced by the plaintiffs to prove their case was the result of the state's efforts to investigate the shortcomings of its correctional system. For example, plaintiffs' exhibit 1 was a 1977 study (commissioned by the state) which recommended building a new prison. Plaintiffs' exhibit 2 was the 1978 five-year plan which was prepared by the Department of Corrections. This plan identified deficiencies in the then-existing system of corrections and contained plans to change them. Plaintiffs' exhibit 3 was the report of the Colorado Attorney General calling for prison reform. The plaintiffs also relied upon the legislative testimony of the Executive Director of the Department of Corrections. This testimony, which was given to

---

[6] Feldberg, *supra,* at 403. *Accord,* Bronstien, *Reform Without Change: The Future of Prisoners' Rights,* 4 Civil Liberties Rev. No. 3 27 (1977); Note, *Decency and Fairness: An Emerging Judicial Role in Prison Reform,* 57 U. Va. L. Rev. 841, 884 (1971); Robbins, *Federalism, State Prison Reform, and Evolving Standards of Human Decency: On Guessing, Stressing, and Redressing Constitutional Rights,* 26 Kan. L. Rev. 551, 562 (1978).

obtain funding for the new prisons, contained a frank assessment of the conditions at the old facility. (*See, e.g.*, R. vol. 30 at 116-17.)

The failure of the federal courts to abstain in cases in which the state government is remedying the problems which exist in its prisons will discourage the states from generating self-critical reports, discussing correctional problems in public, and implementing reforms before being sued. Such voluntary actions should be strongly encouraged and the application of abstention will affirmatively promote this result.

B. THE CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARD

This case presents another major issue of first impression to this Court: What are the proper parameters of the eighth amendment in prison cases? Not only was federal jurisdiction erroneously invoked in this case, but once invoked, the test used to measure the state's liability under the eighth amendment by the district court and the court of appeals was erroneous.

This issue is critical to the states. As of February 1980, prison litigation was pending in 32 states. National Association of Attorneys General, *Implementation of Remedies in Prison Conditions Suits*, 49-51 (1980). The threat of prison or jail litigation exists in virtually every jurisdiction. Yet, to date, the Supreme Court has not stated what the standard of liability is to be in such suits. This presents problems not only for litigants, but to the state governments, who, if given an objective measure of their liabilities, will be able to plan in such a way as to avoid the necessity of litigation. Since the executive branch of government is in a far better position than the courts to effect meaningful prison reform, it is particularly important that the Court establish a standard by which to measure the states' obligations in the administration of their prisons.[7]

---

[7] In *Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520 (1979), this Court emphasized that, "the operation of our correctional facilities is peculiarly within the province of the Legislative and Executive Branches of Government, not the Judicial." *Id.* n. 30 at 548. *Accord, Procunier v. Martinez*, 416 U.S. 397, 404-05 (1974).

This case is the logical sequel to this Court's decision in *Bell v. Wolfish, supra.* In *Wolfish* the Court reversed the Second Circuit which held, *inter alia,* that the conditions of confinement of certain pre-trial detainees (as distinguished from convicted prisoners) were unconstitutional. The basis of the Court's decision was that the standard used by the Second Circuit to measure the government's liability under the fifth amendment's due-process clause did not have a "source in the Constitution." *Id.* at 532. Because the Second Circuit had already reversed that part of the district court's opinion dealing with convicted prisoners, the Court was not presented with the issue of eighth-amendment standards. This case squarely presents that issue.[8]

At all phases of the lawsuit the parties have disagreed over what standard should be applied to measure the state's obligations. Colorado has consistently argued for the narrow, objective standard first enunciated in *Newman v. Alabama,* 559 F.2d 283, 291 (5th Cir. 1977), *cert. denied,* 438 U.S. 915 (1978), in which the court held:

> If the State furnishes its prisoners with reasonably adequate food, clothing, shelter, sanitation, medical care, and personal safety so as to avoid the imposition of cruel and unusual punishment, that ends its obligation under Amendment Eight.

This standard has been adopted by the Second and Fourth Circuits, *Wolfish v. Levi,* 573 F.2d 118 (2d Cir. 1978), *rev'd in part on other grounds, Bell v. Wolfish,* 441 U.S. 520 (1979); *Hite v. Leeke,* 564 F.2d 670 (4th Cir. 1977), and has been quoted in dicta by this Court in *Bell v. Wolfish, supra,* n.11 at 529.

---

[8] While both the district court and the court of appeals utilized the degeneration test in ruling for the plaintiffs, the district court noted that the courts had used various standards to measure liability in prison actions brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. section 1983, 485 F. Supp. at 153-54, n. 20 (A-99, 100). In an attempt to avoid defining an eighth amendment standard, the court stated that "I find the conditions of confinement at the Canon Correctional Facility meet all tests [of liability] by all known measures of proof." *Id.* This of course is no standard, and provides the state with no guidance as to how to avoid future liability.

The plaintiffs, in contrast, have argued for the broader test first enunciated by the Tenth Circuit in *Battle v. Anderson*, 564 F.2d 388, 403 (10th Cir. 1977), in which the court held: "We believe that while an inmate does not have a federal constitutional right to rehabilitation, he is entitled to be confined in an environment which does not result in his degeneration or which threatens his mental and physical well being." In the case at bar, the Tenth Circuit adhered to its degeneration test and held that it was not inconsistent with the *Newman* standard (slip opinion at 13, 15 (A-13, 16)), despite the fact that the *Newman* court specifically rejected the "degeneration" argument, referring to it as an "uncharted bog." 559 F.2d at 291. To date, no other circuit court has adopted the "degeneration" test, although it recently has been used by a federal district court in *Capps v. Atiyeh*, 495 F. Supp. 802 (D. Ore. 1980).

If the "degeneration" test is to be utilized by the federal courts in determining liability, the states will have little chance of successfully defending themselves against "totality" suits. As the *Newman* court noted, *"The mental, physical, and emotional status of individuals, whether in or out of custody, do deteriorate and there is no power on earth to prevent it."* 559 F.2d at 291 (emphasis added). If there is no power on earth to prevent deterioration, prison conditions in even the most modern prisons will render degeneration not only probable, but certain. Under this subjective test, liability cannot be avoided.

This Court should not permit the lower courts to utilize the degeneration test in "totality of conditions" prison litigation. The test is completely subjective. Liability will not be based upon a state's refusal to comply with clearly-defined constitutional criteria, but on the particular views of penology held by the trial judge.

In *Bell v. Wolfish*, *supra*, at 562, the Court warned that many courts have in recent years, "in the name of the Constitution become increasingly enmeshed in the minutiae of prison operations." The Court added that the reason for this trend was that judges "have a natural tendency to believe that their individual solutions to often intractable problems

are better and more workable than those of persons who are actually charged with and trained in the running of a particular institution under examination." *Id.*

The use of the degeneration test magnifies this problem. Under this test, when a judge sees prison programs which differ from those he favors, and when he sees degeneration (as he always will), he is free to declare the conditions at the prison unconstitutional. Because the degeneration test contains virtually no constraints on the ability of the federal courts to impose their concepts of penology on the states, it must be replaced by an objective standard by which the state's conduct can be measured. As the Fifth Circuit has stated, "The Constitution does not require that prisoners, as individuals or as a group, be provided with any and every amenity which *some person* may think is needed to avoid mental, physical, and emotional deterioration." *Newman v. Alabama, supra,* 291. (emphasis added).

Nor is the definition of the eighth amendment standard an academic issue. Prison conditions in Colorado have improved dramatically since the date of trial. The Tenth Circuit did not stay those portions of the district court's order dealing with medical care. The state has, largely, solved the medical problems which existed. The move to the new prisons will remedy most of the deficiencies found by the district court in the areas of physical facilities, personal safety, food, and sanitation. If this lawsuit were brought today and tried under an objective legal standard, the facts would not support a finding of unconstitutional conditions. Nevertheless, Colorado remains under federal judicial scrutiny and continues to be held to the degeneration test — a test which neither fairly measures liability nor sets goals which are possible to attain.

CONCLUSION

This case presents two issues which should be, but have not been, decided by the Court. Because of the importance of these issues and the large number of "totality of conditions" prison cases which are pending in the federal courts, the state asks this Court to issue a writ of certiorari.

Respectfully Submitted,

J. D. MacFARLANE
Attorney General of Colorado

DAVID K. REES
Assistant Attorney General
Litigation Section
Counsel of Record

80-1340

No.

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 6 1981
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1980

The Honorable RICHARD D. LAMM, Governor of the State of Colorado; JAMES G. RICKETTS, Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Corrections; JOHN PERKO, Director of Adult Services of the Colorado Department of Corrections; EDGAR FOX, Director of the Division of Correctional Industries of the Colorado Department of Corrections; and WILLIAM WILSON, Superintendent of the Canon Correctional Facility,

Petitioners,

v.

FIDEL RAMOS, DAVID LEE ANDERSON, SADIKI LISIMBA AJAMU, (a/k/a Eugène Collins), ALEXANDER ROSES, MARK J. MENCHETTI, LESTER LASENBY,

Respondents.

APPENDIX TO THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT.

J.D. MacFARLANE
Attorney General
of Colorado

RICHARD F. HENNESSEY
Deputy Attorney General

MARY J. MULLARKEY
Solicitor General

DAVID K. REES
Assistant Attorney General
Litigation Section

Attorneys for Petitioners

1525 Sherman Street, 3d Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203
Telephone: (303) 839-3611

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit dated September 25, 1980, as modified on rehearing November 10, 1980.	A-1
Opinion of the United States District Court for the District of Colorado dated December 20, 1979.	A-51
Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals dated September 25, 1980.	A-133
Order denying the parties' petitions for rehearing dated November 10, 1980.	A-137
Defendants' exhibit 1137, Memorandum from the Legislative Council staff to Senator Ralph Cole dated August 23, 1979, re: Chronology of Events Concerning the Construction Projects at the Various Correctional Facilities (without attachments).	A-143

OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT DATED SEPTEMBER 25, 1980, AS MODIFIED ON REHEARING NOVEMBER 10, 1980

PUBLISH

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
TENTH CIRCUIT

FIDEL RAMOS, DAVID LEE ANDERSON, SADIKI LISIMBA AJAMU (a/k/a Eugene Collins), ALEXANDER ROSES, MARK J. MENCHETTI and LESTER LAZENBY, et al.	)	
Plaintiffs-Appellees,	)	
v.	)	
	)	NO. 79-2324
THE HONORABLE RICHARD D. LAMM, Governor of the State of Colorado; JAMES G. RICKETTS, Executive Director of the Dept. of Corrections; JOHN PERKO, Director of Div. of Adult Services of Colo. Dept. of Corrections; EDGAR FOX, Dir. of Div. of Correctional Industries of Col. Dept. of Corrections and WILLIAM WILSON, Supt. of Max. Sec. Unit (Warden)	)	(D.C. No. 77-K-1093)
Defendants-Appellants.	)	

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

PREVIOUS PAGE WAS BLANK

J.D. McFarlane, Attorney General, and David K. Rees, Assistant Attorney General, Denver, Colorado (Richard F. Hennessey, Deputy Attorney General; Mary J. Mullarkey, Solicitor General; Sarah Scott Sammons, Assistant Attorney General, Litigation Section; Tarquin Jay Bromley, Assistant Attorney General, Human Resources Section, Denver, Colorado, were on the brief) for Defendants-Appellants

James E. Hartley, of Holland & Hart, Denver, Colorado and Peggy A. Wiesenberg, National Prison Project, Washington, D.C. (Hugh Q. Gottschalk, Denver, Colorado and Ralph I. Knowles, Jr., National Prison Project, Washington, D.C., were on the brief) for Plaintiffs-Appellees

William C. Robb, Denver, Colorado (Philip G. Dufford of Welborn, Dufford, Cook & Brown, Denver, Colorado and Michael T. Risner, State Capitol, Denver, Colorado, were on the brief) for Amicus Curiae The General Assembly of the State of Colorado*

---

* The position of The General Assembly was supported by additional amici curiae, the Attorneys General of States of Alaska, American Samoa, Arizona, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, N. Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, S. Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Illinois, Michigan and Nebraska.

Before HOLLOWAY, BARRETT and LOGAN,
Circuit Judges

HOLLOWAY, Circuit Judge

The defendants-appellants, hereafter the State or the State of Colorado, appeal from an order of the United States District Court directing *inter alia* that the State of Colorado close the maximum security unit of the Colorado State Penitentiary at Canon City, Colorado, hereinafter referred to as "Old Max." The order was premised mainly on findings of numerous violations of the constitutional rights of the plaintiff class (inmates of the penitentiary) under the Eighth Amendment protecting against cruel and unusual punishment, with some additional constitutional infringements also being found. *Ramos v. Lamm,* 485 F.Supp. 122 (D.Colo.). Implementation of the order to close Old Max was deferred on the condition that the State would present proper plans for eradication of the constitutional violations found by the district court.[1] *Id.* at 169-70.

I
THE FACTUAL BACKGROUND

In November 1977 Fidel Ramos, an inmate at Old Max, filed a *pro se* civil rights suit under 42 U.S.C. §1983 against certain State defendants challenging as unconstitutional his status as a "transitional worker" at Old Max and his living conditions at that facility. In February 1978 the National Prison Project and the A.C.L.U. Foundation of Colorado appeared on behalf of Ramos and filed an amended

---

[1] The State of Colorado, after filing a timely notice of appeal on December 28, sought a stay of the judgment from the district court pending final resolution of this appeal. The district court, after a hearing, refused to grant the stay on February 21, 1980. VI R. 1293-C; *Ramos v. Lamm, supra,* 485 F.Supp. at 180. The State of Colorado then filed in this court a motion to stay enforcement of the judgment. On March 14, 1980 we granted the stay except with respect to the portion of the judgment and order which related to the health care of the inmates at Old Max. The stay order has been continued pending disposition of this accelerated appeal on the merits.

complaint, styled as a class action, basically alleging that "the totality of the conditions" at Old Max violated various constitutional rights of the inmates confined in that facility. The amended complaint did not seek compensatory or punitive damages as did the original *pro se* complaint; rather it asked only for declaratory and injunctive relief along with costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees. The district court certified the suit as a class action under Rule 23(a), F.R.Civ.P. and described the class as "[a]ll persons who are now or in the future may be incarcerated in the maximum security unit of the Colorado State Penitentiary at Canon City, Colorado." I R. 62.[2]

After extensive discovery trial began on October 15, 1979. Following five (5) weeks of trial, the district court on November 15 ruled from the bench in favor of the plaintiff class and entered certain emergency orders pertaining to medical care. On December 20 the court filed a memorandum opinion and order supplementing the bench ruling and detailing its findings of violations of the plaintiffs' rights. *Ramos v. Lamm, supra.*[3]

On this appeal the State of Colorado argues that the trial court erred: (1) in refusing to abstain from exercising its jurisdiction in this case; (2) in failing to "apply the correct constitutional standard in making its findings that the totality of conditions at . . . [Old Max] violated the plaintiff class' eighth amendment rights;" (3) in finding a constitutional violation because the evidence, measured under the correct constitutional standard, was insufficient to support such findings; and (4) in choosing an appropriate remedy. We will detail additional facts as we discuss the appellate contentions, to which we now turn.

---

[2] The class definition was later amended at trial to include: "All persons who now or in the future may be incarcerated in the maximum security unit, or the new maximum or close security unit, of the Colorado Department of Corrections." *See* VI R. 1165, 1274; XL R. 128-29.

[3] A final judgment under Rule 54(b), Fed. R. Civ. P., was entered on the claim for injunctive relief. *See Ramos v. Lamm, supra,* 485 F. Supp. at 170. No final judgment was rendered on the claims for attorneys' fees and costs and therefore those claims are not before us now.

II
ABSTENTION

Subsequent to the filing of the amended complaint the State filed a "motion to dismiss and/or abstain." After a hearing the district court denied the motion to abstain without prejudice to the issue being raised at a later time. During closing arguments, counsel for the State again asked the district court to abstain from exercising its jurisdiction.

In its written opinion the court concluded that although it had shown "great deference" to Colorado prison officials in the past, it was unable to continue that deference in light of the "substantial, often compelling, evidence of long existing and continuing constitutional violations." 485 F.Supp. at 132. Accordingly, the district court declined to abstain.

The State first strenuously argues for reversal under the principles enunciated in such cases as *Colorado River Water Cons. Dist. v. United States,* 424 U.S. 800; *Younger v. Harris,* 401 U.S. 37; *Burford v. Sun Oil Co.,* 319 U.S. 315; *Railroad Comm'n v. Pullman Co.,* 312 U.S. 496. The state claims that there were several pending state proceedings in which the conditions of confinement at Old Max were being challenged, that the plaintiffs could have intervened as a matter of right in at least one of these proceedings under Colo. R. Civ. P. 24, and that the plaintiffs could have instituted a §1983 civil rights action in a Colorado state court. Thus abstention was mandated since the plaintiff class had an "opportunity" to present their federal claims in a state forum.

The State further claims that the principle of comity and the critical state interest in the operation of its penal system make federal court abstention "particularly important where the plaintiff challenges the constitutionality of the state's prison system"; that "the state's efforts to establish a coherent policy with respect to a matter of substantial public concern" were disrupted by the district court's refusal to abstain; and that since questions of state law are critical to the resolution of the case, the district court should have abstained. *See* Brief of Appellant at 15-25.

We are acutely aware of the delicate role of the federal courts in matters involving the administration, control, and maintenance by the states of their penal systems — an area historically within the domain and control of those sovereign entities. *See Battle v. Anderson*, 564 F.2d 388, 391-92 (10th Cir.); *Bethea v. Crouse*, 417 F.2d 504, 505-06 (10th Cir.); *see also Procunier v. Martinez*, 416 U.S. 396, 404-05; *Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 491-92. We cannot agree, however, with the State's argument here that the district court abused its discretion[4] in refusing to abstain in view of the serious violations alleged of basic rights under the First, Eight, and Fourteenth Amendments, and the substantial evidence later offered on these claims. *See, e.g., Campbell v. McGruder*, 580 F.2d 521, 527 (D.C.Cir.); *and see Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 562. "The doctrine of abstention, under which a District Court may decline to exercise or postpone the exercise of its jurisdiction, is an extraordinary and narrow exception to the duty of a District Court to adjudicate a controversy properly before it." *Colorado River Water Cons. Dist. v. United States, supra*, 424 U.S. at 813. Only in "exceptional circumstances" should a federal plaintiff be ordered to repair to the state court. *Id.; accord, Zwickler v. Koota*, 389 U.S. 241, 248 (abstention appropriate "only in narrowly limited special circumstances").

In reviewing the district court's refusal to abstain, we note that the Supreme Court has "confined the circumstances appropriate for abstention to three general categories," none of which apply to justify refusal to hear this constitutional case. *Colorado River, supra*, 424 U.S. at 814; *see generally* 17 C. Wright, A. Miller, & E. Cooper, Federal Practice and Procedure §§4241-55 (1978). This is not a case where the federal constitutional issues "might be mooted or presented in a different posture by a state court determination of pertinent state law." *Colorado River Water Cons. Dist. v. United States, supra*, 424 U.S. at 814; *Railroad Comm'n v. Pullman Co., supra*, 312 U.S. at 500-01; *see Manney*

---

[4] The decision to abstain is largely committed to the discretion of the district court. *See e.g., Will v. Calvert Fire Ins. Co.*, 437 U.S. 655, 663-66 (1978) (plurality); *Baggett v. Bullitt*, 377 U.S. 360, 375; *George v. Parratt*, 602 F.2d 818, 819 (8th Cir.).

v. Cabell ____ F.2d ____ (9th Cir. No. 79-3260, April 29, 1980). The *Manney* case does not apply the abstention doctrine in the setting of a correctional institution controversy, but it does so in a case where the application of two state statutes might avoid the federal constitutional issues. Here there are no underlying issues of state law which, if resolved, might avoid the decision of this case as a whole and its substantial constitutional claims, most of which we uphold.[5] The rights claimed to have been violated are plainly federal in origin and nature and are in no way "entangled in a skein of state law that must be untangled before the federal case can proceed." *McNeese v. Board of Educ.*, 373 U.S. 668, 674. The mere fact that a federal claim, brought in federal court, might have been brought instead in state court does not justify abstention. *See, e.g., Zablocki v. Redhail, supra,* 434 U.S. at 379-80 n.5; *Colorado River, supra,* 424 U.S. at 813-14; *Zwickler v. Koota, supra,* 389 U.S. at 251.

Likewise, this is not a case which presents "difficult questions of state law bearing on policy problems of substantial public import whose importance transcends the result in the case . . . at bar." *Colorado River, supra,* 424 U.S. at 814. In *Burford v. Sun Oil Co., supra,* 319 U.S. 315, the Supreme Court held that the district court should dismiss a complaint on the ground that the issues involved a specialized aspect of a complicated local regulatory system which, the court concluded, should be left to local administrative bodies and courts. *See also Alabama Public Service Comm'n v. Southern R. Co.*, 341 U.S. 341, 349. Here local state courts have not been assigned a special review function over the administration and maintenance of Old Max. There is no state adjudicative system charged with the implementation of state policy as in *Colorado River.* Thus the exercise of federal jurisdiction in this case will not cause a widespread disruption of a unified scheme of local regulation. *See, e.g., Campbell v. McGruder, supra,* 580 F.2d at 525; *Santiago v. City of Philadelphia,* 435 F.Supp. 136, 145 (E.D.Pa. 1977); *see generally Procunier v. Martinez, supra,* 416 U.S. at 405-06; *Preiser v.*

---

[5] It is true, as the State points out, that the district court did discuss and interpret several state statutes. *See* 485 F.Supp. at 139, 146, 157, 159-60, 167 n. 44. However, resolution of these state law questions does not mandate the conclusion that the district court should have abstained from deciding this case which is primarily concerned with federal constitutional law. *See Hagans v. Lavine,* 415 U.S. 528, 545-46.

Rodriguez, supra, 411 U.S. at 499 & n.14. The fact that a federal constitutional challenge is made against state penal administration "does not establish that the controversy is an unduly sensitive one beyond legitimate federal concerns." *McRedmond v. Wilson*, 533 F.2d 757, 764 (2d Cir.).

Finally, this is not a case in which the plaintiffs have attempted to enjoin a pending state proceeding initiated by the state against them in which they would have an opportunity to present their federal claim in a state forum. *See Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971); *see also Moore v. Sims*, 442 U.S. 415, 423-25. Here there is no pending state proceeding initiated by the state. There are only pending actions in the state court with a number of similar issues, in which the plaintiff class might have intervened. "Generally, as between state and federal courts, the rule is that 'the pendency of an action in the state court is no bar to proceedings concerning the same matter in the Federal court having jurisdiction . . . .' " *Colorado River, supra*, 424 U.S. at 817; *accord, Will v. Calvert Fire Ins. Co., supra*, 437 U.S. at 662 (plurality) and 670 (Brennan, J., dissenting). Consequently, the district court correctly determined that abstention under the *Younger* line of cases was inappropriate. *See Ramos v. Lamm, supra*, 485 F.Supp. at 174.

In sum, we conclude there was no error or abuse of discretion by the district court in declining to abstain from hearing this constitutional case and the substantial constitutional claims asserted. As the Supreme Court noted in *Procunier v. Martinez, supra*, 416 U.S. at 405-06:

> [A] policy of judicial restraint cannot encompass any failure to take cognizance of valid constitutional claims whether arising in a federal or state institution. When a prison regulation or practice offends a fundamental constitutional guarantee, federal courts, will discharge their duty to protect constitutional rights.[6]

---

[6] Appellant argues that *Procunier* is distinguishable because in that prison case "there was no parallel state proceeding and . . . [it] was strictly a first-amendment case." Reply Brief of Appellant at 4. We cannot agree that the Supreme Court's reasoning logically applies only to First Amendment claims. And for reasons already noted we do not feel that the pending state proceedings justified abstention from hearing this case.

Like the trial judge, we are moved by the words of Judge Murrah from *Stapleton v. Mitchell,* 60 F. Supp 51, 55 (D. Kan.), words recalled by the Supreme Court in *Zwickler v. Koota, supra,* 389 U.S. at 248, in describing the duty of federal courts "to guard, enforce, and protect *every* right granted or secured by the Constitution of the United States":

> We yet like to believe that whenever the Federal Courts sit, human rights, under the Federal Constitution are always a proper subject for adjudication, and that we have not the right to decline the exercise of that jurisdiction simply because the rights asserted may be adjudicated in some other forum.

III
THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT CLAIMS

In a bifurcated argument the State, supported by the Colorado General Assembly as amicus, challenges the district court's ultimate finding that the constitutional rights of the plaintiff class have been violated as a result of the conditions of confinement at Old Max. Their general line of argument is that (1) the trial court failed to use the correct constitutional standard in assessing the Eight Amendment claims, and (2) the evidence, measured by the correct standard, "is insufficient to support the trial court's finding that the conditions of confinement. . . constitute cruel and unusual punishment." See Brief of Appellant at 25, 34; Brief of Amicus Curiae at 13-14.

We will consider the constitutional standard to be applied to the Eight Amendment claims first. Then we will analyze the more specific challenges to the trial court's findings leading to its conclusion that the State has violated the constitutional guarantee.

A. THE CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARD

In *Battle v. Anderson, supra,* 564 F.2d at 393 we stated that "the Supreme Court has not wavered in its holding that the Eight Amendment. . . is, *inter alia,* intended to protect and safeguard a prison inmate from an environment where

degeneration is probable and self-improvement unlikely because of the conditions existing which inflict needless suffering, whether physical or mental." In affirming the district court's finding there that overcrowding in the Oklahoma State Penitentiary violated the inmates' Eighth Amendment rights, we held "that while an inmate does not have a federal constitutional right to rehabilitation, he is entitled to be confined in an environment which does not result in his degeneration or which threatens his mental and physical well being." *Id.* at 401, 403.

The district court and the plaintiffs rely to some degree on this language from *Battle* to support the conclusion that a constitutional violation occurred here.[7] *See* 485 F.Supp. at 133, 156; Brief of Appellee at 43, 101. The State and the amicus say that it was error to apply the "degeneration standard" from *Battle,* error which taints the finding that the totality of conditions at Old Max violate the Eighth Amendment. They urge that we adopt instead the standard enunciated in *Newman v. Alabama,* 559 F.2d 283, 291 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied,* 438 U.S. 915:

> If the State furnishes its prisoners with reasonably adequate food, clothing, shelter, sanitation, medical care, and personal safety so as to avoid the imposition of cruel and unusual punishment, that ends its obligation under Amendment Eight.

See Brief of Appellant at 27-33; Reply Brief of Appellant at 6, 9-11; Brief of Amicus Curiae at 8-9, 11-14.

---

[7] The district judge did not rely solely upon the quoted language from *Battle* in finding that the inmates' constitutional rights had been violated. He also stated (485 F.Supp. at 153-54 n.20):

> I find that *the conditions of confinement* at . . . [Old Max] *meet all tests by all known measures of proof.* As shown by substantial evidence, these conditions shock the conscience, are incompatible with evolving standards of decency, involve unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain, and evidence both deliberate indifference to the prisoners' protected interests and "circumstances and conduct so grossly incompetent, inadequate or excessive as . . . to be intolerable to basic fairness." (Emphasis added).

See also Brief of Appellees at 37-38.

We see no conflict between our decision in *Battle* and the Fifth Circuit's decision in *Newman*. The standard announced in *Battle* concerned degeneration in relation to the entire penal environment — the conditions of confinement. These conditions were not identified in *Battle* beyond inadequate cell space. We conclude that in the areas of shelter, sanitation, food, personal safety, and medical care — the core areas in any Eighth Amendment claim[8] — the district court's findings and conclusions of violations of the plaintiffs' rights are entirely justified and supported by the record. We do not think, however, that the record in this case requires or justifies going into all of the concepts on penology pressed by the plaintiffs and adopted in the district court's opinion — the concepts of motility, classification, and idleness — since the shortcomings in these areas are not of constitutional dimension. While there may be a point where abuse in these areas would constitute an actual violation of the Eighth Amendment guarantee, we hold that in this case the present record and the findings on these subjects do not warrant the court's broad remedial orders (485 F.Supp. at 170) intruding into these areas of prison administration. *See Battle v. Anderson, supra,* 564 F.2d at 403; *Newman v. Alabama, supra,* 559 F.2d at 291-92; *Marchesani v. McCune,* 531 F.2d 459, 462 (10th Cir.), *cert. denied,* 429 U.S. 846.

Thus we conclude that the district court did not apply an improper constitutional standard here in making its findings on shelter, sanitation, food, personal safety, and medical care at the Colorado prison.

B. THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THE FINDINGS OF EIGHTH AMENDMENT VIOLATIONS

With a few exceptions, the State generally admits that there was "little conflict in the evidence which was introduced at trial." Instead its argument is "directed towards what it feels was a clearly erroneous assimilation of those facts" by the district court. Brief of Appellant at 25-26, 37.

---

[8] We would agree that adequate clothing is also a core area of consideration in an Eighth Amendment claim. However, because it is not an issue in this case, we need not discuss it.

Thus it appears the State is mainly arguing that the undisputed evidence does not support the court's ultimate finding and conclusion that the conditions of confinement at Old Max violate the Eighth Amendment rights of the inmates. *See generally* XLV R. 106-07.

After extensive hearings and a personal inspection of the prison, the district court made detailed findings of fact in the core areas which we have mentioned. Such findings by the trial judge who heard and saw the evidence may not be set aside on appeal unless they are clearly erroneous. *See e.g., Rasmussen Drilling, Inc. v. Kerr-McGee Nuclear Corp.*, 571 F.2d 1144, 1148-49 (10th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 439 U.S. 862 (1978); *Battle v. Anderson, supra*, 564 F.2d at 400; F.R.Civ.P. 52(a).[9] The resolution of conflicts in the evidence and the appraisal of credibility of witnesses are for the trial court hearing a case without a jury. *See Rasmussen Drilling, Inc. v. Kerr-McGee Nuclear Corp., supra*, 571 F.2d at 1149. Guided by these principles we will consider the findings in detail.

1. SHELTER AND SANITATION

The district court made a general finding that the inmates of Old Max "are housed under conditions which fall below all recognized constitutional and professional standards."[10] 485 F. Supp. at 133. Specifically it found *inter*

---

[9] In applying Rule 52 the Supreme Court has said that

> A finding is "clearly erroneous" when although there is evidence to support it, the reviewing court on the entire evidence is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.

United States v. United States Gypsum Co., 333 U.S. 364, 395.

[10] The appellants point out that professional standards "establish goals and simply do not establish constitutional minima." Reply Brief of Appellant at 11, quoting *Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 544. While we agree that a variance from state standards or from standards promulgated by certain professional organizations does not establish a *per se* constitutional violation, it is a factor to be considered in determining whether contemporary standards of decency have been met. *See, e.g., Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 103-04 & n. 8; *Smith v. Sullivan*, 611 F.2d 1039, 1045 (5th Cir.); *Burks v. Walsh*, 461 F. Supp. 454, 483 (W.D. Mo.); *Palmigiano v. Garrahy*, 443 F. Supp. 956, 961 n. 2, 979-80 n. 30 (D.R.I.); *see generally Battle v. Anderson, supra*, 564 F.2d at 395.

alia that "[t]he main living areas of Old Max are unfit for human habitation"; that most of the cells in which inmates are confined provide for barely one-half the square footage of space required by modern correctional standards; and that "[e]nvironmentally Old Max is inadequate to meet the health and safety needs of prisoners in the correctional system." *Id.* at 134. With respect to the "physical environment," the court found that the "conditions are grossly inadequate and constitutionally impermissible." *Id.* at 155.

The State argues that much of the court's criticism of Old Max is directed at the prison's design, which it admits "is a vestige of the past and is not consistent with modern penology." Brief of Appellant at 48. The "salient point" according to the State "is that long before this suit was filed, the state had begun to build a 'state of the art' prison which will not have the deficiencies of the present Auburn prisons." *Id.* It argues that since the designing of Auburn style prisons was stopped in the late 1960's, and the constitutionality of using certain cells at Old Max was upheld by this court in 1975, "its beginning to plan a new prison in 1976 is overwhelming evidence that it is keeping pace with evolving standards of decency that mark a maturing society."[11] *Id.* at 50. The State also says that since "the length of confinement must be considered" in determining whether constitutional standards have been violated, the trial court's failure to recognize that Old Max will soon be closed voluntarily constitutes reversible error. *Id.* Finally, with respect to sanitation, the State argues that "the totality of circumstances in sanitation cannot be held to be unconstitutional" because the evidence clearly shows that sanitation "has improved greatly over the last few years"; that cleaning activity has increased significantly under the directorship of defendant Ricketts; and that many of the sanitation problems at Old Max are a direct result of the inmates' absolute refusal to help keep the prison clean. *Id.* at 56-57.

---

[11] Although construction of a new prison should be considered in devising an appropriate remedy, *see* Part VII, *infra*, we must agree with the district court that it is not a defense to demonstrated present constitutional violations. *See* 485 F. Supp. at 167-68; *see also Battle v. Anderson*, *supra*, 564 F.2d at 403.

In response, plaintiffs argue that "the undisputed findings establish that the physical conditions of confinement at Old Max are 'grossly inadequate' "; that the construction of new prison facilities which will be completed in the future is not a defense to present unconstitutional conditions of confinement; and that there is no record evidence which supports the State's claim that Old Max will be closed voluntarily or permanently. Answer Brief of Appellees at 46-49, 55-59.

In *Battle v. Anderson, supra,* we upheld the district court's conclusion that "[i]t is incumbent on the incarcerating body to provide the individual with a healthy habilitative environment." 564 F.2d at 395. In affirming in *Battle,* we upheld the finding that 60 square feet of living space was the minimum amount of square footage which the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments require that a state provide an inmate. *Id.* at 395, 397, 403. A necessary corollary to this ruling is that a state must provide within such living space reasonably adequate ventilation, sanitation, bedding, hygienic materials, and utilities (*i.e.,* hot and cold water, light, heat, plumbing). *Id.* at 394-95, 403; *see also Bono v. Saxbe,* 620 F.2d 609, 613 (7th Cir.); *Hite v. Leeke,* 564 F.2d 670, 674 (4th Cir.); *Palmigiano v. Garrahy, supra,* 443 F. Supp. at 979; *Laaman v. Helgemoe,* 437 F.Supp. 269, 308-09, 323 (D.N.H.). In short, a state must provide an inmate with shelter which does not cause his degeneration or threaten his mental and physical well being. *Battle v. Anderson, supra,* 564 F.2d at 403.

Considering the record in light of this standard, the evidence showed these facts. Old Max came into existence as a territorial prison in the late 1860's before Colorado became a state. The physical facility as it exists now "dates from 1895, with numerous additions, the most recent in 1971." II App. Exh. 26; I App. Tes. 15-17. Approximately 1000 inmates are housed in five cellhouses within the walls of the institution and one cellhouse outside the prison walls. I App. Tes. 16-17; IV App. Tes. 114; Brief of Appellant at 39.

Most of the prison population is housed in three cellhouses — 1, 3 and 7. Cellhouse 1, built in 1948, contains approximately 360 inmates who are assigned single cells

which are 35 square feet in size, with net usable space of about 14 square feet. I App. Tes. 43-44; II App. Exh. 97; V R. 849. Cellhouse 3, built in 1951, contains approximately 86 prisoners in protective custody, administrative segregation, punitive segregation, or deathrow. Inmates in cellhouse 3 are not considered members of the general prison population since they are locked in their cells an average of 23 hours a day. I App. Tes. 19. These cells do not provide the inmate the 60 square feet of space required in *Battle*.[12] Cellhouse 7 was built in 1938 and is structurally similar to cellhouse 1.[13] It houses approximately 390 inmates who are either in protective custody or administrative segregation, or who are classified as transitional workers (*i.e.* inmates without jobs). Cellhouse 7 has 326 cells of 31.5 square feet and 64 cells, used for administrative segregation, of approximately 62 square feet. I App. Tes. 30; II App. Exh. 165-66; V R. 862; XXIII R. 11; XXIX R. 50.

The remainder of the prison population is housed in cellhouses 4 and 5 and the Diagnostic Unit. Cellhouse 4, built in the 1930's, is located outside the prison walls and once was used as the women's prison. The cells are about 40 square feet. I App. Tes. 17, 44-45. Cellhouse 5 is located under the prison infirmary and houses about 20 trustee inmates.[14] *Id.* at 17. The Diagnostic Unit cellhouse is a

---

[12] Appellants admit "that most of the cells in cellhouses 1 and 7 do not provide the sixty square feet per inmate required by *Battle*. . . ." Brief of Appellant at 52. There is some indication in the record that the cells in cellhouse 3 are smaller than those in cellhouses 1 and 7. *See* I App. Tes. 392-93. However the record, the appellate briefs, and the district court's opinion do not reveal the exact size of the cells in cellhouse 3. However, the district court did find that these cells in cellhouse 3 failed to meet the *Battle* standard, *see* 485 F.Supp. at 134, and the defendants do not contest this finding.

[13] In 1975, cellhouse 7 was closed and plans were made to tear it down. However, after the prison riot in May 1975, it was reopened to relieve overcrowded condition of cellhouse 1. Brief of Appellant at 41; I App. Tes. 31; 485 F.Supp. at 134.

[14] The record does not reflect the size of the cells in cellhouse 5. Appellant claims that cellhouse 5 houses approximately 40 prisoners who live "in cubicles, not cells, which surround a central common area." Brief of Appellant at 40.

three-tier unit which was built in 1962 and currently houses 120 inmates. The cells in this unit are approximately 49 square feet. I App. Tes. 45-46, 369; III App. Tes. 110. Thus we note that there is a widespread deficiency in living space under the *Battle* standard.

Aside from the deficiency in cell size, the buildings where inmates live are in a serious state of disrepair and fail to meet minimal health and safety needs of the prisoners. For example, the roofs in the major cellhouses and the prison auditorium leak, despite repair work. *See* I App. Tes. 27, 392, 395, 398; III App. Tes. 131-32; II App. Exh. 130-32, 144-45. Existing heating and ventilation systems are incapable of providing adequate temperature control and ventilation in the cellhouses and in some work buildings used by the inmates. *See* III App. Tes. 102-03, 128-46; 189, 191; II App. Exh. 130-32, 143-50, 158, 162-66, 196-97, 200.

Inadequate ventilation, especially in the cells and shower areas, results in excessive odors, heat, and humidity with the effect of creating stagnant air as well as excessive mold and fungus growth, thereby facilitating personal discomfort along with health and sanitation problems. *See* II App. Exh. 158, 162-67. Leaking pipes and defective plumbing cause sewage to accumulate in cells and service areas or to drain into adjacent or lower cells, resulting in innumerable health and safety problems which, when combined with the temperature control and ventilation problems, make the main living areas particularly unfit for human habitation. *See* I App. Tes. 29, 42, 44, 85; II App. Exh. 11-13, 26, 131-51; III App. Tes. 131-47, 215; IV App. Tes. 116-17; XXXIII R. 83-85, 106.

In addition, the evidence also shows an extensive problem with rodent and insect infestation in the cellhouses. *See* I App. Tes. 27, 191-92; II App. Exh. 145, 147, 163, III App. Tes. 109-10, 128-46, 195-96. Trash, decayed food, and other material routinely litter the cells and corridors of the cellhouses, conditions which are partially the product of the inmates' own actions. *See*, I App. Tes. 27-28, 196; II App. Exh. 131-45, 162, 167, III App. Tes. 137-38. Nevertheless, many of the health and sanitation deficiencies, were found to be "the result of a lack of routine maintenance and cleaning programs." 485 F.Supp. at 136. Bath water in the shower

areas remains impounded on the floors due to obstructed drains. Missing ceramic floor tiles make shower room floors exceptionally difficult to clean and provide areas for significant mold and slime buildup. Metal stubs sticking up through the floor along with exposed electrical wiring provide additional health hazards to inmates using the shower facilities. *See* I App. Tes. 203; II App. Exh. 130-32, 144, 148-52, III App. Tes. 107-09, 125-26, 143, 147, 195. These deficiencies could be corrected by routine maintenance and cleaning prgrams. *See* II App. Exh. 130-32, 162-68.

The health and sanitation problems extend beyond the common-use areas and into the individual cells. The evidence shows that in some instances inmates are not provided with enough cleaning supplies to allow them to adequately clean their own cells. *See* I App. Tes. 197; III App. Tes. 18, 125-27, 197. Numerous broken windows and the lack of window screens contribute significantly to the fly infestation problem. *See id.* at 128. The bedding used by inmates is heavily stained and soiled, and is not cleaned or changed when a new inmate is assigned to a cell. *See id.* at 105-07, 131, 139; II App. Exh. 144, 152; I App. Tes. 196. These items could also be corrected by routine maintenance and cleaning programs. *See* II App. Exh. 162-68.

Without doubt, the State's inability to meet minimal shelter and sanitation standards contributes immeasurably in making the main living areas unfit for human habitation. III App. Tes. 215. Unquestionably, the small cells in which inmates are confined, along with the deteriorating and unsanitary conditions in the main living areas, have a direct detrimental impact on the health and well being of the inmates. Considering the record as a whole we must sustain the trial court's findings and conclusion that the conditions in which inmates are confined at Old Max are "grossly inadequate and constitutionally impermissible."

2. FOOD

The district court found that the "[c]onditions in the food services areas . . . fail to meet any known public health standards"; the kitchen facilities and equipment are obsolete and unsanitary; state health code violations persist, after nu-

merous inspections; most of the deficiencies are "caused by a lack of routine maintenance, operational and cleaning procedures"; these deficiencies "have long been serious problems"; and the "unsanitary conditions have a direct impact on the health of the inmate population." 485 F. Supp. at 136, 155. The court concluded that these "conditions are grossly inadequate and constitutionally impermissible." *Id.* at 155.[15]

The state recognizes that the court's findings concerning the sanitation in the kitchen areas are "extremely serious." However, it argues that the court "pieced together various facts and failed to accurately reflect the totality of conditions" at Old Max. Brief of Appellant at 53-54. Moreover, because this is "the one area in which the defendant's evidence significantly conflicted with the plaintiff's evidence," the State complains that the court failed to note favorable testimony from a defense witness concerning the kitchen facility, despite the court's conclusion that all state witnesses were credible. *Id.* at 52, 54. Finally, although it does not deny the health code violations, the State objects to the district court's use of state health department standards in determining whether the conditions in the food service area violate constitutional standards. *Id.* at 55-56.

As we noted earlier, the State must provide an inmate with a "healthy habilitative environment." This includes providing nutritionally adequate food that is prepared and served under conditions which do not present an immediate danger to the health and well being of the inmates who consume it. *See, e.g., Palmigiano v. Garrahy, supra,* 443 F. Supp. at 962, 979; *Laaman v. Helgemoe, supra,* 437 F. Supp. at 309, 323; *Pugh v. Locke,* 406 F. Supp. 318, 329 (M.D. Ala), *aff'd as modified sub nom., Newman v. Alabama,* 559 F.2d 283, 288 (5th Cir.), *rev'd in part sub nom., Alabama v. Pugh,* 438 U.S. 781, *cert. denied, Newman v. Alabama,* 438 U.S. 915; *see also Campbell v. McGruder, supra,* 580 F.2d at 548, *Sweet v. South Carolina Dept. of Corrections,* 529 F.2d 854, 862 (4th Cir.). Moreover the state health code, while not establishing "constitutional minima," is relevant in making a finding regarding the constitutionality of existing conditions. *See* note 10 *supra; see also Williams v. Edwards,* 547 F.2d 1206, 1214 (5th Cir.).

---

[15] There is no claim here that the food being served to the inmates is nutritionally inadequate.

Here conditions in the main food service areas are substantially similar to the unsanitary conditions which exist in the main living areas. The physical plant itself is old, outdated, and poorly maintained. Kitchen equipment is in a state of disrepair. The dishwasher in the main kitchen leaks water all over the floor, creating a safety hazard for those working in the kitchen area. Floor drains barely function and standing pools of water are common. Rotting food remains on floors which are not readily cleanable due to their deteriorated condition. Ventilation throughout the main kitchen is inadequate and high temperatures are common.

In addition, sanitation deficiencies are compounded by a highly irregular and ineffective cleaning program. The floors, walls, windows, and food storage shelves throughout the food service area are soiled with dirt and rodent droppings. The walls of the walk-in coolers where food is stored have mold growing on them. Floor fans used to circulate the air cause dust and lint to be blown over the food preparation and dishwashing areas. Rodent and insect infestation is extensive.

Inmate workers are not given basic instruction on food protection and food service sanitation.[16] Consequently food items are stored on the floors of walk-in storage compartments and food is often left uncovered allowing the rodents and roaches to contaminate it. Food products which can support food borne diseases are not properly stored and are often left out at room temperature. Food preparation surfaces and cooking equipment are not properly cleaned and therefore provide areas for significant bacterial growth. Food, when it is being served to inmates, is kept at substandard temperatures due to the improper use of the available equipment. *See* III App. Tes. 98-102, 110-125, 209; II App. Exh. 283-88.

After inspecting such conditions the Colorado Department of Health itself found that "[s]ubstantial deficiencies exist in the food service facilities" at Old Max. As of July 17, 1979, that state agency refused to issue a Certificate of Inspection for the food service facilities since they were not "in

---

[16] III App. Tes. 119.

substantial compliance with the 'Rules and Regulations Governing the Sanitation of Food Service Establishments in the State of Colorado.' " II App. Exh. 255, 291. It was the conclusion of Mr. Gordon, an expert in the field of environmental health, sanitation, and safety,[17] that *"the food service [at Old Max] represents imminent danger to the health and well-being of the inmates consuming food in that operation."* XXIX R. 35 (emphasis added); *see also* III App. Tes. at 94, 199-200, 205-06, 215.

Considering all the evidence, we conclude that the record amply supports the district court's findings and conclusions that the conditions in the food service areas at Old Max are unsanitary and have a substantial and immediate detrimental impact upon the health of the inmate population. We must uphold the court's findings and conclusions that the conditions in the food service areas at Old Max "are grossly inadequate and constitutionally impermissible."

3. PERSONAL SAFETY

The district court found that the inmates and correctional staff at Old Max have lived in an atmosphere of tension, anxiety and fear, resulting in an unsafe environment for both; that the institution "is still fraught with tension and violence"; and that "[t]he design and staffing of all the major housing units contribute immeasurably to violence between inmates, often leading to severe injury and death." 485 F. Supp. at 140-42. It also found that the conditions of confinement, one of which was the lack of physical safety for inmates, "evidenced. . . deliberate indifference to the prisoners' protected interests." *Id* at 153-54 n. 20. The court concluded that the lack of safety deprived prisoners of their constitutional right to be reasonably protected from constant threats of violence and sexual assault from other inmates. *Id.* at 155-56.

---

[17] In the District of Columbia, Mr. Gordon was serving by appointment of the Mayor as Program Manager for a special task force on inspection of city-wide, community-based residential facilities. Previously he was Chief of the Institutional Hygiene Division of the District of Columbia Environmental Health Administration. XXIX R. 2-3.

The State claims that the district court has distorted the facts and has "patched together various portions of the record under the guise of making a finding of the totality of conditions" at Old Max; that it "has failed to distinguish between the prison's *history* of violence and the conditions which existed in October 1979"; that the level of violence at Old Max has been "significantly reduced" in recent years; that the reference to suicides and self-mutilatory gestures is improper since a state has no duty to keep an inmate from hurting himself; and that reliance upon the number of inmates in protective custody to show that fear and violence exists at Old Max is misplaced since Old Max houses protective custody cases from other prisons in the state system. Brief of Appellant at 57-64. The State further says that the current staffing levels at Old Max are based on the needs of the new prison which is currently being built and that the district court's finding that inadequate staffing at Old Max contributes to inmate violence is inconsistent with its finding that the prison's physical design makes it impossible to provide adequate security. *Id.* at 58. Finally, the State argues that the district court has misconstrued the law concerning a prisoner's right to safety and that the plaintiff class has failed to show that the State has acted with deliberate indifference toward their safety. *Id.* at 62-64.

As we noted in *Marchesani v. McCune*, 531 F.2d 459, 462 (10th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 429 U.S. 846, a "[p]rison setting is, at best, tense. It is sometimes explosive, and always potentially dangerous." Nevertheless, as the State concedes, an inmate does have a right to be reasonably protected from constant threats of violence and sexual assaults from other inmates. Brief of Appellant at 62. *See Clappier v. Flynn*, 605 F.2d 519 (10th Cir.); *Hite v. Leeke*, 564 F.2d 670, 673 (4th Cir.); *Finney v. Arkansas Bd. of Correction*, 505 F.2d 194, 201 (8th Cir.). Moreover, he does not need to wait until he is actually assaulted before obtaining relief. *See Woodhous v. Virginia*, 487 F.2d 889, 890 (4th Cir.).

Here the evidence shows that in recent years the inmate population at Old Max has been plagued with violence and the fear of violence. *See* II App. Exh. 109; XXXVII R. 55-58, 61-64; and Brief of Appellant at 6-7. In May 1975 a major riot occurred at Old Max. In August 1976 the Governor of Colo-

rado ordered prison officials to conduct a massive lockup of the total prison population to help reduce the violence and other criminal activity which was occurring inside the prison walls. *See* I App. Exh. 97, 108; XXXVII R. 66. In 1977 a special project team investigated Colorado's correctional system and concluded "that an environment of tension, anxiety, and fear exists for both inmates and correctional staff" at Old Max. II App. Exh. 15, 25. In June 1978 an interagency crisis committee, investigating attempted suicides in cellhouse 3, concluded that under the current conditions and staffing patterns, security could not be maintained in that cellhouse. *Id.* at 114.

The violence and fear which permeated the prison population of Old Max in past years continues to exist. The efforts of many inmates are directed at merely staying alive while they serve their sentences. IV App. Tes. 118. Protective custody inmates are routinely threatened and attacked by other inmates. *See* XXVII R. 121-24; XXXVII R. 84; I App. Tes. 39. Prison records for 1978 and part of 1979 show a significant number of stabbings, assaults, fights, and threats. *See* II App. Exh. 227-47; I App. Tes. 79-87, 429-31; II App. Tes. 188-90. Undoubtedly many more incidents go unreported. *See* I App. Tes. 79, 429; II App. Tes. 189.

The evidence indicates that the architecture of the cellhouses and the physical layout of buildings and other structures contribute to the violence and illegal activity between inmates. II App. Exh. 12, 26, 89-90, 97-100, 105-06, 110; IV App. Tes. 117; XXXIII R. 52-61; XXXVII R. 185. The architecture of cellhouses 1 and 7, which was designed for a less mobile prison population, does not provide adequate visibility for guards to properly monitor from secure vantage points inmate movement within the cellhouse. *See* I App. Tes. 42-44, 389-90; II App. Exh. 97; XXXIII R. 58-61. The internal structure of the cellhouses along with the random construction of the buildings, walls, and fences within the perimeter of the prison provide numerous "blind areas" where violence, threats, and other illegal activities can occur without detection by prison officials. *See,* XXVII R. 95-97; I App. Tes. 42-43, 85-86, 431; IV App. Tes. 72, 113; II App. Exh. 89-90; XXXIII R. 52-61.

Violence and illegal activity between inmates at Old Max is further facilitated by the inadequacy of the staffing levels. Past investigations by the State revealed that staffing levels at Old Max were insufficient to provide adequate security for inmates and staff and that the lack of adequate supervision and surveillance of inmates contributes significantly to violence and other illegal activity. *See* II App. Exh. 12, 89-90, 97-100, 105-07, 111, 114. Despite the reports which highlighted the need for increased staffing at Old Max, the Colorado Department of Corrections actually decreased its security staff in fiscal year 1978-79. *See* IV App. Tes. 131. The expert witnesses, including the former executive director of the Department of Corrections, overwhelmingly concluded that current staffing levels at Old Max continue to be inadequate and cannot provide a reasonably safe environment for inmates.[18] *See* I App. Tes. 20-44.

Although a larger security staff would not completely obviate the inmate safety problem the evidence shows that additional security personnel could significantly reduce it.[19] *E.g.*, I App. Tes. 21-22, 76-78; II App. Exh. 12. We are convinced that the record amply supports the finding that the State has been "deliberately indifferent" to the legitimate

---

[18] The district court did note that "violence at Old Max has been significantly reduced, [but that] the threat of occurrence is omnipresent." 485 F. Supp. at 155-56. Since violence has been "significantly reduced," appellants argue that "it cannot be said that the level of violence at the institution violates the plaintiffs' constitutional rights." Brief of Appellant at 62, 64. We disagree. Merely because the current level of violence and illegal activity is statistically lower than in past years does not mean that the present situation meets minimum constitutional standards. *See Finney v. Arkansas Bd. of Correction*, 505 F.2d 194, 201 (8th Cir.); *Holt v. Sarver*, 309 F. Supp. 362, 377 (E.D. Ark.), *aff'd*, 442 F.2d 304 (8th Cir.).

[19] If the appellants are suggesting, by their reference to their proposed 1981 budget, that they lack sufficient funds to increase the security staff at Old Max, we must reject their argument. The lack of funding is no excuse for depriving inmates of their constitutional rights. See *Smith v. Sullivan*, 611 F.2d 1039, 1043-44 (5th Cir.); *Campbell v. McGruder*, 580 F.2d 521, 540 (D.C. Cir.); *Battle v. Anderson*, *supra*, 564 F.2d at 395-96, 400; *Palmigiano v. Garrahy*, 443 F. Supp. 956, 979 (D.R.I.) and cases cited therein.

safety needs of the inmates confined at Old Max.[20] *See Palmigiano v. Garrahy, supra,* 443 F. Supp. at 973, 980; *see also Little v. Walker,* 552 F.2d 193, 197-98 n.8 (7th Cir.), *cert. denied,* 435 U.S. 932. Accordingly we must uphold the court's finding and conclusion that the State has failed to reasonably protect inmates from constant threats of violence and assaults from other inmates and that this failure violates the inmates' constitutional rights under the Eighth Amendment.

4. HEALTH CARE

The district court found that "the blatant inadequacy of health care is perhaps the most appalling" of all the problems at Old Max and that the State has "been aware of grave and systemic deficiencies in the medical care delivery system at Old Max for years." 485 F. Supp. at 142, 158. It concluded that:

> The failures of Old Max extend across the board from inadequate staff and resources to insufficient transportation arrangements to lack of training and qualification of the limited staff that does exist. The problem is not simply a matter of isolated incidents of alleged negligence or difference of opinion. It is a matter of such large scale failure as to evidence deliberate indifference to serious health needs.

Id. at 158.

The State argues that the district court "misconstrued the applicable law and failed to accurately reflect the evidence in the record." Brief of Appellants at 82, 117; Reply Brief of Appellants at 11-13. With respect to the medical care which is provided to inmates at Old Max, the State admits that deficiencies existed prior to 1977. However, it says that the "[h]ealth care provisions at . . . [Old Max] must be seen in

---

[20] Appellees claim that the "deliberate indifference" standard is applicable only in §1983 damage actions against specific prison staff members. Brief of Appellee at 73-74. While it appears that a showing of deliberate indifference is not a prerequisite to obtaining the injunctive and declaratory relief sought here, *see Withers v. Levine,* 449 F. Supp. 473, 479 (D.Md.), *aff'd,* 615 F.2d 158, 162 (4th Cir.), *petition for cert. pending,* No. 79-6535 (May 5, 1980), we need not reach this issue since the record here supports the finding of deliberate indifference.

a continuum"; that the general standard of care provided has been upgraded consistently and that the evidence shows that "[t]he medical facilities, equipment, and staff. . .[are] sufficient to deliver adequate medical care to the prison population." Brief of Appellants at 104, 115. The State further claims that the record does not show "deliberate indifference" by prison officials to inmates' medical needs and that the trial court's conclusion concerning the inadequacy of medical care at Old Max is based on "isolated instances" of inadequate or improper medical care. *Id.* at 99-100.

With respect to mental health care, the State relies on *Bowring v. Godwin,* 551 F.2d 44 (4th Cir.) and maintains that the evidence shows that out of the entire prison population only 15 inmates were identified as being "seriously mentally ill." According to the State, the evidence did not show "that action by health care personnel could have made any appreciable difference in the condition of these [15] inmates." Furthermore, the evidence also failed to show that prison officials were deliberately indifferent to "inmates' serious psychological/psychiatric needs." Brief of Appellants at 107-09. Consequently the State argues that the court erroneously concluded that inmates at Old Max received constitutionally inadequate health care from the State.

As the State admits, it has a constitutional obligation "to provide medical care for those whom it is punishing by incarceration." *Estelle v. Gamble,* 429 U.S. 97, 103; Brief of Appellants at 97. We are convinced that this duty necessarily requires that the State "make available to inmates a level of medical care which is reasonably designed to meet the routine and emergency health care needs of inmates." *Battle v. Anderson,* 376 F. Supp. 402, 424 (E.D. Okla.); *accord, Laaman v. Helgemoe, supra,* 437 F. Supp. at 312. This includes medical treatment for inmates' physical ills, dental care, *see, e.g., id.* at 313, and psychological or psychiatric care, *see, e.g., Inmates of Allegheny Cty. Jail v. Pierce,* 612 F.2d 754, 763 (3rd Cir.), *on remand,* 487 F. Supp. 638, 643 (W.D. Pa.); *Bowring v. Godwin, supra,* 551 F.2d at 47.

Although the constitutional standard for adequate health care has not been fully spelled out, the Supreme Court has held in the context of a §1983 action for damages

and injunctive relief that only "deliberate indifference to serious medical needs" of prisoners violates the Eighth Amendment proscription against cruel and unusual punishment. *Estelle v. Gamble, supra,* 429 U.S. at 106; *see also Twyman v. Crisp,* 584 F.2d 352, 355 (10th Cir.). Consequently, accidental or inadvertent failure to provide adequate medical care, or negligent diagnosis or treatment of a medical condition do not constitute a medical wrong under the Eighth Amendment. *See Estelle v. Gamble, supra,* 429 U.S. at 105-06. *A fortiori,* a mere difference of opinion between the prison's medical staff and the inmate as to the diagnosis or treatment which the inmate receives does not support a claim of cruel and unusual punishment. *See, e.g., Bowring v. Godwin, supra,* 551 F.2d at 48; *Smart v. Villar,* 547 F.2d 112, 114 (10th Cir.).

The two-pronged *Estelle* standard "requires deliberate indifference on the part of prison officials and it requires the prisoner's medical needs to be serious." *West v. Keve,* 571 F.2d 158, 161 (3d Cir.). A medical need is serious if it is "one that has been diagnosed by a physician as mandating treatment or one that is so obvious that even a lay person would easily recognize the necessity for a doctor's attention." *Laaman v. Helgemoe, supra,* 437 F. Supp. at 311; *See also West v. Keve, supra,* 571 F.2d at 162-63 n.6. Deliberate indifference to serious medical needs is shown when prison officials have prevented an inmate from receiving recommended treatment or when an inmate is denied access to medical personnel capable of evaluating the need for treatment. *See, e.g., Inmates of Allegheny Cty. Jail v. Pierce, supra,* 612 F.2d at 762; *Todaro v. Ward,* 565 F.2d 48, 52 (2d Cir.). In class actions challenging the entire system of health care, deliberate indifference to inmates' health needs may be shown by proving repeated examples of negligent acts which disclose a pattern of conduct by the prison medical staff, *see id.* at 52, or by proving there are such systemic and gross deficiencies in staffing, facilities, equipment, or procedures that the inmate population is effectively denied access to adequate medical care. *See, e.g., Inmates of Allegheny Cty. Jail v. Pierce, supra,* 612 F.2d at 762-63; *Todaro v. Ward, supra,* 565 F.2d at 52; *Williams v. Edwards, supra,* 547 F.2d at 1215; *Palmigiano v. Garrahy, supra,* 443 F. Supp. at 983-84; *Laaman v. Helgemoe, supra,* 437 F. Supp. at 312-13; *Battle v. Anderson, supra,* 376 F. Supp. at 424. Much of the evidence presented at

trial is relevant to this last standard of "deliberate indifference."

The record shows that the medical staff at the infirmary in Old Max is responsible for providing medical services for all the prison facilities in the Canon City area, including the maximum security prison, the medium security prison, and the women's prison — a total inmate population of approximately 1,400. XXV R. 82-83; XXXVIII R. 5, 100-01. In addition, the medical staff is responsible for the initial medical and dental screening of all new prisoners entering the Colorado prison system — approximately 1,350 inmates in 1978. XXXVIII R. 101, 114.

Despite the large number of prisoners who depend on the Old Max staff for medical services, the State provides less than 10 hours per week of on-site primary physician coverage. Expert witnesses agreed that a minimum of 40 hours per week of on-site primary care physician coverage is needed for the Maximum Security Prison (Old Max) to meet minimally acceptable standards of health care. *See* XXV R. 80-84, 90-92, 201; XXXVIII R. 75, 78-79, 101-02; Brief of Appellants at 85. One expert indicated that "primary care physician on-site coverage" is the "most important aspect of the medical care services at the facility" and that 10 hours per week is *"grossly inadequate."* XXV R. 90 (emphasis added); *see also* I App. Tes. 238; XXV R. 96; XXXVIII R. 74-75. Expert witnesses uniformly agreed that a four-fold increase in primary physician coverage was necessary, along with additional on-site coverage from specialists. *See* XXV R. 92, 126-27, 200-02, 213; XXXVIII R. 74-78. The State's expert admitted that in order to meet minimally acceptable standards of health care, there must be at least 4 hours per week of on-site coverage from a general internist and a general surgeon, and 4 hours of on-site coverage every other week from an ear, nose, and throat specialist and an orthopedic surgeon. *See* XXXVIII R. 76, 79; *see also* XXV R. 126-27, 201. At the time of trial this specialist coverage was not provided.[21]

---

[21] The record does show that a certified radiologist comes to Old Max two days a week to perform diagnostic X-ray procedures and an optometrist comes once a week to perform optical examinations and prescribe glasses for inmates. XXXVIII R. 28-29, 44-45, 80-81.

Experts from both sides agreed that because of the inadequacy of on-site primary physician coverage, other medical personnel are being used as "physician substitutes" and are being forced to make decisions and perform services for which they are neither trained nor qualified. XXV R. 90-98, 113-14, 127; XXXVIII R. 75; *see also* XXI R. 129. Experts agreed that the current practice of leaving "standing orders" — a system where the physician leaves instructions for handling a number of medical situations which may arise — could be "dangerous" and cannot substitute for adequate on-site physician coverage. XXV R. 172-74; Brief of Appellants at 86. One expert described a number of "typical" incidents where inadequately supervised medical staff have misdiagnosed or improperly treated inmates' medical conditions and have on occasion caused potentially life-threatening situations along with needless pain and suffering. XXV R. 99-125; *see also* I App. Tes. 234, 270-73.

Prisoners generally have more extensive dental problems than the average citizen. Consequently dental care is one of the most important medical needs of inmates. XXV R. 133; XXXVIII R. 85, 113. In August 1978 the Old Max infirmary provided only 12 hours per week of on-site dental care by a licensed dentist. XXXVIII R. 35, 116. Prior to trial only 28 hours per week of on-site dental care was available at the Old Max infirmary — a level of coverage which experts agreed was inadequate to meet the needs of the prison population at Old Max. XXV R. 134, 182; XXXVIII R. 84-85. During the trial, the State increased the on-site dental care coverage at the Old Max infirmary to 40 hours per week which, according to the State's expert witness, is sufficient for an inmate population of 800 to 1,000. XXXVIII R. 35, 84-85. However, since the medical staff at Old Max is responsible for providing dental care for a prison population of approximately 1,400, along with screening a large number of new prisoners, dental care coverage remains inadequate to meet the needs of Old Max inmates. *See* XXXVIII R. 35, 113-117; *see also* II App. Exh. 8. This conclusion is further supported by evidence which shows that as of July 1979, inmates needing oral surgery had to wait an inordinant amount of time before receiving proper care and that these inmates when not treated in a timely fashion are prone to develop infections and abscesses leading to continued and unnecessary pain and loss of teeth. XXV R. 135.

In addition to the physicians and dentists, the medical staff at the Old Max infirmary includes three Physician's Assistants (PA's), three Registered Nurses (RN's), one licensed practical nurse (LPN) and one nurse practioner. XXV R. 89, 136, 170; XXXVIII R. 39-40, 44, 109. Although the infirmary is open 24 hours a day, seven days a week, PA's are scheduled only five days a week. However, at least one PA is "on call" during the hours when there are none in the infirmary. *Id.* at 41-44. Expert testimony indicated that there is a "definite need" for several more PA's. XXV R. 90; *see also* XXXI R. 142-43. The evidence also indicates that there is no Registered Nurse working the late night shift, notwithstanding a state health department regulation requiring that an RN be on duty 24 hours a day. XXV R. 136-38; XXXVIII R. 109; II App. Exh. 5; Brief of Appellant at 86.

While there was some dispute by the experts as to the proper scope of medical services which should be provided by the staff at the infirmary, it is clear from the evidence that in order to meet the needs of inmates the medical staff must currently rely on medical services provided by civilian health care facilities. *See* XXXVIII R. 46-48, 56. Consequently an integral part of the prison health care program is the transportation of inmates to and from the locations where the medical care is given. *See* XXV R. 128-29. At the time of trial the medical department at Old Max did not have any security staff or vehicles assigned to it solely for the purpose of transporting inmates to health facilities. The one prison vehicle used for transporting inmates to outside health facilities is also used for transporting prisoners to court. The lack of staff and vehicles often results in cancellation of planned medical trips in order to transport inmates to court. Transportation cancellations result in a serious backlog of prisoners who are waiting to be sent to outside facilities for needed care. I App. Tes. 254; II App. Exh. 6-7; XXV R. 128-29; XXXVIII R. 48-49, 78, 121, 128-29.

Expert witnesses uniformly recognized that transportation problems exist which unnecessarily delay the delivery of health care services to inmates. *See* I App. Tes. 254; IV App. Tes. 130; XXV R. 128-33; XXXVIII R. 48-49, 78, 126-31. One prison official who is directly responsible for health

care at Old Max testified that the medical department needed to have its own staff to transport prisoners to the prison infirmary and the outside health facilities. More importantly, this prison official admitted that the medical staff has an "essential need" for at least 6 additional officers along with 2 cars which are used exclusively for transporting prisoners to outside medical facilities. *See* XXXVIII R. 48-49, 130-31.

Undoubtedly because of the lack of civilian staff, the State has permitted inmates to be used in delivering health care services to the inmate population. The evidence shows that inmates are used as lab technicians, dental assistants, orderlies, X-ray technicians, and as file clerks in the medical records department. XXV R. 138; XXXVIII 28-30, 33-34, 37, 45-46, 87, 120-23; II App. Exh. 5, 91. Expert testimony indicated that "virtually all" existing standards of health care in correctional institutions prohibit the use of inmate personnel in providing direct health services to other inmates. XXV R. 139.

Dr. King, attending physician in the Department of Medicine at the Cook County Hospital in Chicago and Assistant Professor in the Department of Community Health and Preventive Medicine at Northwestern University, testified after reviewing the medical services provided at Old Max. He concluded that: *"Given the types of staffing and the types of other resources such as transportation, certain equipment deficiencies, I do not believe that they [the defendants] are able to provide minimally adequate basic medical care."* XXV R. 158, 72. (Emphasis added). A State expert concluded that additional personnel and equipment were necessary to provide adequate medical care at the Old Max infirmary. XXXVIII R. 90.

Inadequate staffing also negatively affects the delivery of reasonable mental health care to those inmates who are seriously mentally ill. Experts estimated that 5-10% of the inmates at Old Max are "seriously mentally ill" and that another 10-25% need treatment although they are not seriously ill. I App. Tes. 229-31, 245, 373; XXV R. 176; *but see* XXXI R. 68. One expert found that there are clearly more

inmates at Old Max who need psychiatric or psychological treatment than are receiving it. I App. Tes. 231-32. Another expert concluded that the "[m]ental health service at Old Max is extremely limited and totally incapable of providing the mental health care of those who have been identified as having severe, chronic or acute disorders. . . ." II App. Tes. 191; *see also* I App. Tes. 245-46, 376, 382-83; II App. Tes. 301. The lack of adequate mental health services, according to this expert, contributes to inmate suffering and at times causes suicide and self-mutilation by inmates. II App. Tes. 209; *see also* I App. Tes. 233-35, 254-55.

As the State admits, there is no on-site psychiatrist or licensed Ph.D. psychologist at Old Max to provide daily care and counselling for inmates. A psychiatrist from the state reformatory is scheduled to visit Old Max once a month, but in the year before trial had only come once every two months. One expert found that this level of psychiatric coverage is "ridiculously pathetic" considering the number of "clearly recognizable seriously ill people" at Old Max. I App. Tes. 233; *see also* II App. Tes. 198.

Efforts to obtain further psychiatric coverage have been frustrated due to the lack of funding. XXXI R. 138-39. In fact psychiatric coverage has been cut back in order to increase dental and optometric coverage. XXV R. 112. Experts uniformly agreed that for Old Max to have a minimally adequate mental health program it needed at least one full time psychiatrist. I App. Tes. 255-56; II App. Tes. 192, 196-97.

At the time of trial the regular mental health staff at Old Max consisted of three civilians and two inmates who do clerical work. XXXIV R. 80, 116. The clinical staff members apparently spend more of their time on administrative work than on the treatment of ill inmates. *See* XXXI R. 90; XXXIV R. 80. Once an inmate is placed on a waiting list, it takes anywhere from 2-5 weeks before he is seen by a member of the mental health staff. *Id.* at 85. One expert witness found that the mental health staff is overworked, undertrained, and underqualified. II App. Tes. 200-09. Both experts who testified on mental health matters found that the work by individual staff members was not being competently handled. I App. Tes. 225-26; II App. Tes. 209.

Considering the evidence as a whole, we must hold that the district court was not in error in finding that the medical and mental health staffs of Old Max are "grossly inadequate." Because of the staff shortages inmates are effectively denied access to diagnosis and treatment by qualified health care professionals. Such conditions endanger their health and well being, make unnecessary suffering inevitable, and evince on the part of the State a deliberate indifference to the serious health needs of the prison population. Accordingly, we must uphold the district court's findings and conclusion that the State has subjected the plaintiff class to cruel and unusual punishment in that it has denied them access to reasonably adequate health care.[22]

IV
RESTRICTIONS ON VISITATION

In addition to the Eighth Amendment violations, the district court found that prison visitation policies "are overbroad and prevent or impair meaningful visitation without being necessary to any legitimate penological purpose" and do not take into consideration individual circumstances. 485 F. Supp. at 162. It was further found that the current restrictions on visitation "are an exaggerated and excessive response to concerns for prison security." *Id.* The court held that these policies improperly infringe upon inmates' fundamental rights of association, privacy, and liberty which are protected by the First, Ninth, and Fourteenth Amendments. *Id.* at 150-51, 161-62.[23]

The State argues that the court ignored well established law, erroneously cited professional and other standards to

---

[22] As noted earlier because of the deep concern of the panel as to this problem, we did not stay the provisions of the district court's order pertaining to health care. Our full review of the case reenforces our concerns on this medical care question which is of paramount importance.

[23] Under the general heading "Access," the district court held that certain prison policies concerning visitation, mail, and the law library violated inmates' constitutional rights. The issues of restrictions on prisoners' mail are discussed below in Part V, *infra*, while the issues of access to the courts and the prison law library are treated in Part VI, *infra*.

establish constitutional minima, and improperly relied on a line of cases dealing with the sanctity of the family which is inapplicable in a prison setting. The State says that since 1976 visitation policies have gradually been relaxed, new policies and regulations enhance the visitation process, all inmates except those in segregated units are permitted contact visits, and the restrictions presently imposed are constitutional since they "are clearly justified by the legitimate policies and goals of the correctional system." Brief of Appellants at 125-29.

When confronted with the question whether inmates have a constitutional right to receive visits from family and friends, courts have reached varying results. *See, e.g., White v. Keller,* 438 F. Supp. 110, 114-19 (D. Md), *aff'd,* 588 F.2d 913 (4th Cir,); *Laaman v. Helgemoe, supra,* 437 F. Supp. at 320-22 and cases discussed therein. However we need not decide this basic issue since the district court did not find, nor is it claimed by the plaintiffs, that prison officials are denying visitation entirely.

Assuming that such a right exists, the Supreme Court has made it clear that "lawful incarceration brings about the necessary withdrawal or limitation of many privileges and rights, a retraction justified by the considerations underlying our penal system." *Pell v. Procunier,* 417 U.S 817, 822; *accord, Jones v. North Carolina Prisoners' Union,* 433 U.S. 119, 125; *See generally Daughtery v. Harris,* 476 F.2d 292 (10th Cir.), *cert. denied,* 414 U.S. 872. A corollary in the context of a First Amendment claim "is that a prison inmate retains those First Amendment rights that are not inconsistent with his status as a prisoner or with the legitimate penological objectives of the corrections system."[24] *Pell v. Procunier, supra,* 417 U.S. at 822. We think that the underlying principle of this corollary is also applicable to rights

---

[24] Legitimate penological objectives thus far identified by the Supreme Court include "the preservation of internal order and discipline, the maintenance of institutional security against escape or unauthorized entry, and the rehabilitation of the prisoners." *Procunier v. Martinez,* 416 U.S. 396, 404, 412; *see also Bell v. Wolfish,* 441 U.S. 520, 546-47; *Pell v. Procunier, supra,* 417 U.S. at 822-23 (deterrence of crime is an important function of the corrections system along with rehabilitation and security).

which are guaranteed by other constitutional provisions. *See Bell v. Wolfish, supra,* 441 U.S. at 544-48, 554; *Jones v. North Carolina Prisoners' Union, supra,* 433 U.S. at 125, 129.

When an institutional restriction infringes on a specific constitutional right, the prison policy must be evaluated in light of the legitimate objectives of penal administration — security, order and rehabilitation. *See Bell v. Wolfish, supra,* 441 U.S. at 520. And when the policy in question involves the entry of people into the prison for face-to-face contact with inmates, security and related administrative considerations are sufficiently paramount to justify the imposition of some restrictions on such visits. *Pell v. Procunier, supra,* 417 U.S. at 826-27; *see also Jones v. North Carolina Prisoners' Union, supra,* 433 U.S. at 125-26. Because the running of a penal institution is both complex and difficult, prison administrators are to be "accorded wide-ranging deference" in adopting and executing policies and practices which, in their judgment, are necessary to preserve internal order and discipline and to maintain institutional security. *Bell v. Wolfish, supra,* 441 U.S. at 547; *Jones v. North Carolina Prisoners' Union, supra,* 433 U.S. at 126. "Such considerations are peculiarly within the province and professional expertise of corrections officials, and, in the absence of substantial evidence in the record to indicate that officials have exaggerated their response to these considerations, courts should ordinarily defer to their expert judgment in such matters." *Pell v. Procunier, supra,* 417 U.S. at 827; *accord, Bell v. Wolfish,* 441 U.S. at 547-48; *Jones v. North Carolina Prisoners' Union, supra,* 433 U.S. at 128.

The regulations being challenged here permit each inmate a total of 5 full days or 10 half days of visiting privileges per month. Visits by attorneys are not counted against inmate visiting days. Prisoners are permitted visitors on specific days between Thursday and Sunday. All visitors must be on an approved visitors list which is generally limited to the inmate's immediate family.[25] If an inmate has no immediate family residing in Colorado, he may have 3 non-family visitors on his approved list, which is limited to 13

[25] The regulation provides that an inmate's "immediate family includes spouse, common-law spouse, fiance if inmates are respectively not married, children, stepchildren, grandparents, siblings, step-siblings, or legal guardian, parents, and step parents." VII Supp. R. Pl. Exh. No. 128 at 3.

persons. Changes in individual visiting lists may be made each 60 days. VII Supp. R. Pl. Exh. No. 128 at 2-4; Def. Exh. No. 1107.

Because of security problems which existed with open visitation, prison officials, beginning in 1976, did not permit inmates to have physical contact with their visitors. IV App. Tes. 128-29. Instead, inmates and their visitors sat in booths with glass partitions between them and spoke with each other through telephones. In July 1979, prison officials removed the glass partition in many booths to permit limited physical contact between inmates and visitors. With the exception of those inmates confined in segregated units, who must use the partitioned booths,[26] inmates may now kiss their visitors at the beginning and conclusion of a visit. They may hold hands with their visitors and may hold small children on their laps. Any other type of bodily contact is prohibited. I App. Tes. 402; XXXVIII R. 117; VII Supp. R. Pl. Exh. No. 128 at 7; Def. Exh. No. 1107; Brief of Appellants at 128.

As noted, the district court found that these regulations were overbroad, unrelated to any legitimate penological purpose, and an exaggerated and excessive response to concerns for prison security. We cannot agree with the trial court's conclusions on this subject.

There can be no doubt that contact visits between inmates and their visitors provide a unique opportunity for passing contraband, including weapons and drugs, into the prison. *See Feeley v. Sampson, supra,* 570 F.2d at 373; *see generally Woods v. Daggett,* 541 F.2d 237, 240 (10th Cir.); *Daughtery v. Harris, supra,* 476 F.2d at 294. Prison officials have chosen to permit limited contact visitation for most inmates as opposed to some other method of countering a

---

[26] Because this part of the plaintiff class is denied contact visitation privileges, the question of whether such visits are mandated by the constitution is properly presented. Although the Supreme Court has not addressed this particular issue, *see Bell v. Wolfish, supra,* 441 U.S. at 559-60 n. 40, we think the weight of present authority clearly establishes that there is no constitutional right to contact visitation. *See, e.g., Feeley v. Sampson,* 570 F.2d 364, 373 (1st Cir.); *Oxendine v. Williams,* 509 F.2d 1405, 1407 (4th Cir.) (per curiam); *Lock v. Jenkins,* 464 F. Supp. 541, 550 (N.D. Ind.); *Owens-El v. Robinson,* 457 F. Supp. 984, 988 (W.D. Pa.); *aff'd in part, rev'd in part sub nom., Inmates of Allegheny Cty. Jail v. Pierce,* 612 F.2d 754, 758-60 (3d Cir.); *see also White v. Keller, supra,* 438 F. Supp. at 114-19. We agree with this view.

known security problem. This decision should be accorded deference so long as it is a reasonable response to the legitimate concerns of prison security. The existence of less restrictive alternatives is not dispositive of the matter, *see, e.g., Inmates of Allegheny Cty. Jail v. Pierce, supra*, 612 F.2d at 759; *Feeley v. Sampson, supra*, 570 F.2d at 373, for we are convinced that the discretion of prison officials in these matters should stand unless patently unreasonable.

We cannot say that this record "conclusively" shows that the prison officials were wrong in considering unlimited contact visitation a threat to the security and order of the prison. *See Bell v. Wolfish, supra*, 441 U.S. at 555. Nor is there any basis in the record for saying that the restrictions imposed on contact visitation are irrational. In fact the record shows that the current restrictions on contact visitation have been successful in discouraging the transfer of contraband between inmates and their visitors. *See* I App. Tes. 404; *cf. Bell v. Wolfish, supra*, 441 U.S. At 559.

With respect to the regulation allowing three non-family visitors to be on an inmate's approved visiting list only when the inmate does not have immediate family residing in Colorado, we think that the regulation is a rational response to legitimate penal concerns. The current regulation permits inmates to have personal contact with those individuals whom prison officials believe are most likely to aid in their rehabilitation, while keeping visitations at a manageable level that will not jeopardize institutional security. *See Pell v. Procunier, supra*, 417 U.S. at 827. Those prisoners who have immediate family in Colorado may still communicate with non-family friends by using the mails or by communicating to these individuals through the family members and attorneys who are permitted to visit them. *See id.* at 823-25 & n. 4. So long as these alternative channels of communication are open to prison inmates, we think that the numerical and qualitative restrictions on inmates' visitors are not unreasonable. *See id.* at 827-28.

Accordingly, the trial court's ruling on the visitation regulations must be set aside.

V

RESTRICTIONS ON PRISONERS' MAIL

Under the subject of "access" the trial court dealt with several regulations concerning prisoners' mail. It was held that certain prison censorship rules complied with the requirements of *Procunier v. Martinez*, 416 U.S. 396, 418-19; that in case of rejection of a letter to or from an inmate, the writer must be given an opportunity to protest the decision; that complaints thereon be referred to a prison official other than the one who originally disapproved the correspondence; and that notice that correspondence has been rejected must contain a brief but adequate explanation, with rejected correspondence being returned to the sender. The trial judge also upheld the regulation prohibiting the receipt of periodicals and other materials not mailed directly from the publisher or an established vendor or distributor. 485 F. Supp. at 163. No appellate issue is raised as to these rulings.

However, other mail restrictions were held invalid by the trial court. First, it was found that there is a policy of refusing to deliver mail in a language other than English; that one-third of the population at Old Max is Hispanic; that "[n]umerous prisoners lack speaking, reading and writing skills in English, as do many of their correspondents"; and that the English language rule seriously infringed protected First and Fourteenth Amendment interests without being necessary to any legitimate penological purpose. 485 F. Supp. at 151, 164. Beyond the general argument that the trial court's order intrudes on prison administration, there is no argument or authority presented in defense of this language discrimination by the State with respect to correspondence. We must agree with the trial court that the policy as applied infringes on the constitutional rights of the defendants, without any reasonable justification furthering an important or substantial state interest. *See Procunier v. Martinez*, 416 U.S. 396, 413.

Second, the court found that there is a policy of refusing to deliver mail when correspondence would allegedly cause

severe psychiatric or emotional distrubance to an inmate. CCF Reg. 302-18(7)(b). The trial court found that such a restriction is not wholly unreasonable on its face, but that there is an anomaly in that there is no qualified psychiatrist or psychologist at the prison to make a decision whether receipt of certain correspondence would cause such disturbance. The court ruled that until there is such personnel to apply the rule, it is void and may not be applied. Again, there is no specific defense on this restriction by the State, nor any authority or evidence presented to justify the application of the rule while the medical personnel deficiency exists. We feel again that, in the circumstances, the order of the trial court was not in error in restraining the enforcement of the restriction until qualified personnel is available to apply the rule. *See Guajardo v. Estelle,* 580 F.2d 748, 757 (5th Cir.).

Third, the trial court found that the prison regulation does not make clear that in those exceptional circumstances when outgoing privileged (legal) mail may be opened, it can only be opened in the presence of the sending inmate. The court held that such presence of the sender is required when the opening of his mail occurs. 485 F. Supp. at 164. In this instance also there is no specific defense of the prison policy and we agree again with the ruling of the trial court. *See Hardwick v. Ault,* 447 F. Supp. 116, 129-30 (M.D. Ga.); *see also Gates v. Collier,* 501 F.2d 1291, 1310-14 (5th Cir.); *Carty v. Fenton,* 440 F. Supp. 1161, 1163 (M.D. Pa.) (incoming privileged mail must be opened in the presence of the inmate).

Fourth, the trial court found that in defining "legal mail," the regulations state that such mail is "any mail directed between an inmate and any public official or agency or any lawyer with respect to either his criminal conviction *or a complaint he might have concerning the administration of the prison under exceptional circumstances.*" CCF Regulation 302-18(6) (emphasis added). The court found that the latter qualification is not allowable. 485 F. Supp. at 164. No authority or record evidence is cited by the State as a specific defense of this regulation. We therefore sustain the trial court's ruling, holding invalid the restrictive definition of legal mail quoted above. The protection afforded the legal correspondence applies equally to criminal and civil mat-

ters, and privileged correspondence with counsel, public officials, and agencies cannot be thus confined. *See Guarjardo v. Estelle,* 580 F.2d 748, 758 (5th Cir.).

In sum, we must agree that in the particulars discussed the restrictions on prisoners' mail are invalid under the First and Fourteenth Amendments, being unjustified under the standards laid down by the Supreme Court in *Procunier v. Martinez, supra,* 416 U.S. at 413. We accordingly affirm the rulings of the district court in these respects.

VI
ACCESS TO THE COURTS

The district court found that the three law libraries at Old Max "fall below any known acceptable standard." *Ramos v. Lamm, supra,* 485 F. Supp. at 151. More specifically the court found that the general population library contains approximately half the volumes recommended by the American Association of Law Libraries Committee on Law Library Services to Prisoners; that this library consists mainly of outdated advance sheets, pocket parts, and discards from other sources; and that the separate law libraries for protective custody inmates in Cellhouse 7 and for segregated inmates in cellhouse 3 have fewer materials and are far more inadequate than the general population library.

With respect to the staffing of these facilities, the court found that while there is inmate assistance available for those inmates who need help, there is no civilian staff with legal or paralegal training to supervise the libraries or to assist inmates with research. The court also found that the law libraries are open five days a week, that prison regulations permit only 13 inmates to use the law library facilities each day (65 inmates per week), that each library visit is limited to a maximum of three hours, and that with the current inmate population at Old Max, a prisoner may have access to a prison law library for only three hours every 13 weeks. *Id.* at 151-52, 165-66. Considering the prison's facilities and rules as a whole, the district court held that inmates are not provided with "meaningful access to the courts." *Id.* at 166.

The State argues that the trial court erred in finding that the law library facilities and the library regulations at Old Max are constitutionally defective; that existing facilities "far exceed" those which were approved by the Supreme Court in *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817; and that there was no evidence, showing a pattern or practice by prison officials of denying inmates access to legal materials, library facilities or the courts, or showing that any inmate had been prejudiced (*i.e.*, by dismissal of a case) or substantially harmed due to current prison regulations or facilities. Brief of Appellants at 129-34.

It is now clear that inmates have a constitutional right to "adequate, effective, and meaningful" access to the courts and that the states have "affirmative obligations" to assure all inmates such access. *Bounds v. Smith, supra*, 430 U.S. at 822, 824. In *Bounds* the Supreme Court held that "the fundamental constitutional right of access to the courts requires prison authorities to assist inmates in the preparation and filing of meaningful legal papers by providing prisoners with adequate law libraries or adequate assistance from persons trained in law." *Id.* at 828. However the ruling in *Bounds* does not hold that inmates have an absolute right to any particular type of legal assistance. *See Williams v. Leeke*, 584 F.2d 1336, 1339 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 442 U.S. 911. The states are still free to choose among a variety of methods or combinations thereof in meeting their constitutional obligations. *See Bounds, supra*, 430 U.S. at 830-32.

Under some circumstances, however, even the existence of an adequate law library will not satisfy the State's constitutional duty. *See Id.* at 823-24 & n. 10-11; *Twyman v. Crisp*, 584 F.2d 352, 357 (10th Cir.); *Glover v. Johnson*, 478 F. Supp. 1075, 1096 (E.D. Mich.); *Wade v. Kane*, 448 F. Supp. 678, 684 (E.D. Pa.) *aff'd without opinion*, 591 F.2d 1338 (3d Cir.); *see also Battle v. Anderson*, 614 F.2d 251, 255 (10th Cir.); *Wetmore v. Fields*, 458 F. Supp. 1131, 1142-43 (W.D. Wis.). The existence of prison regulations that limit an inmate's access to the law library or that limit the time, place, and manner in which he can engage in legal research or preparation of legal documents must be considered. *See Twyman v. Crisp, supra*, 584 F.2d at 358; *Elkanich v. Alexander*, 315 F. Supp. 659, 662 (D. Kan.), *aff'd*, 430 F.2d 1178 (10th Cir.) (per

curiam); *see generally* annot., 23 A.L.R. Fed. 1, 28 (1975 & Supp. 1979). In order to properly evaluate existing conditions, courts must consider the regulations, facilities, and available resources together as a whole, remembering that "meaningful access" is the touchstone of this constitutional guarantee. *See Bounds, supra,* 430 U.S. at 823, 832; *Twyman v. Crisp, supra,* 584 F.2d at 357-58.

Here the record shows that the State has chosen to provide both law libraries and inmate assistance. Old Max has three law "libraries," each serving a different segment of the inmate population. The library in cellhouse 3 is used exclusively by the inmates in that building. Cellhouse 7 library is for the exclusive use of protective custody inmates in that building. The remainder of the prison population, except for inmates housed in the Diagnositic Unit, is permitted to use the general population law library. Inmates in the Diagnositc Unit do not have direct access to any law library facility.[27] XXXI R. 7-8; XXXIX R. 26-27, 58-59; VII Supp. R. Pl. Exh. No. 36 at 1.

Current regulations indicate that the general population law library is open 12½ hours a day, five days a week and that the library in cellhouse 3 is open four hours a day, five days a week. *Id.* at 1; *see also* Brief of Appellants at 133; Brief of Appellees at 141. The testimony at trial, however, indicated that during the summer months the libraries are closed in the evenings. XXXIX R. 24-25. The record does not show that any regulations currently exist for the use of the library in cellhouse 7, although the State claims that it is open the same number of hours as the cellhouse 3 library. The absence of regulations for this library is possibly due to the fact that it was just being stocked with books at the time of trial and was not in operating order prior to that time. *See* Brief of Appellants at 132; XXXIX R. 26-27.

The record also shows that prison officials permit a maximum of six inmates to use the general population library at one time, while only one inmate is allowed to use the

---

[27] The record does show that an inmate library clerk visits the Diagnostic Unit one morning every week to help inmates with their legal needs. XXXI R. 7-8; XXXIX R. 27, 58-59.

library in cellhouse 3 at any one time. Library time is allocated among inmates by the prison's school supervisor based on daily requests from inmates. Priority is given to inmates facing court deadlines. Inmates are limited to approximately three hours or less per visit. Regulations prohibit inmates from checking out legal materials from the library.[28] At the time of trial, an inmate requesting use of the general population library normally could obtain access the same day. Waiting lists in the past have required inmates to wait no longer than a week. Apparently the State has kept no records on inmate use of the libraries in cellhouse 3 and 7.

The law books available to inmates vary, depending on the library being used. The evidence shows that the library in cellhouse 3 has only a few volumes of the Federal Reporter (2d series) and the Federal Supplement. The State admits that the cellhouse 7 library "contains approximately the same materials as the library in cellhouse 3." *Id.* A prison library which lacks these basic materials is an inadequate law library. *See Wade v. Kane, supra,* 448 F. Supp. at 682; *see also Bounds, supra,* 430 U.S. at 819-20 n.4. Consequently, we must agree with the district judge who saw the facilities that the law libraries in cellhouse 3 and 7 fall below acceptable standards and cannot alone provide inmates with meaningful access to the courts.

The general population law library is the largest of the three law libraries at Old Max. Its book collection consists mainly of paperback advance sheets and other outdated material. An evaluation of this library, prepared by an outside source at the request of the State in 1978, determined that many of the volumes were unusable and should be discarded. This same report concluded that the book collection is "wholly inadequate" to meet the minimum standards of the American Association of Law Libraries Committee on Law Library Service to Prisoners — standards which the Supreme Court found relevant in *Bounds, supra,* 430 U.S. at

---

[28] The regulations do permit inmates, absent compelling reasons to the contrary, to purchase law books or other legal materials from the primary sources of supply (*i.e.*, the publisher). These purchased items may apparently be kept by the inmate in his cell. *See* VII Supp. R. Pl. Exh. No. 39 at 5-6.

819-20 n.4. The State's most recent inventory of the library's law books shows that volumes are missing throughout its collection of federal decisions (*i.e.*, U.S. Reports, Supreme Court Reporter, Federal Reporter, 2d Series, and Federal Supplement). *E.g.*, VII Supp. R. Pl. Exh. No. 37 at 11, 22; VIII Supp. R. Def. Exh. No. 1123 at 1-10. Consequently we must agree with the trial judge that the general population library is inadequate and does not meet the needs of the inmates who use it.

Concluding that the prison's law libraries are inadequate does not end our inquiry. We must also consider the adequacy of alternative methods which the State has adopted to satisfy its constitutional duty of affording inmates meaningful access to the courts. The record shows that the State has allowed 3 inmate law library clerks to provide assistance to those inmates who request help. XXXIX R. 26-29. However there are no specific findings concerning the training or competence of these library clerks and the State has not pointed to any record evidence which would show these critical factors.[29] Consequently we think the State has failed to demonstrate that it has furnished an adequate alternative means of access to the courts for the inmates. *See Buise v. Hudkins*, 584 F.2d 223, 228 (7th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 440 U.S. 916; *Cruz v. Hauck*, 515 F.2d 322, 332 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 424 U.S. 917; *compare Hampton v. Schauer*, 361 F. Supp. 641 (D. Colo.). In this connection we note that there is no evidence that the inmate library clerks have access to any law library facility other than the inadequate ones at Old Max. Even an individual highly trained in the law would be unable to provide competent assistance to others if forced to depend solely upon the inadequate law libraries at Old Max.

Accordingly, we sustain the district court's finding and conclusion that the State has denied the inmates meaningful access to the courts in violation of their constitutional rights.

---

[29] One defense witness did state that he "believed" the inmate library clerks knew "how to use the books and assist other inmates with the use of the books." XXXIX R. 25. This evidence does not show, however, that the library clerks are capable of helping any inmate draft a legal document. More importantly, this evidence does not show that the library clerks are capable of helping the large number of prisoners who, as the district court found, are unable to speak, read, or write in English. 485 F. Supp. at 151.

VII
THE REMEDY AND DISPOSITION OF THIS APPEAL

To remedy the constitutional violations found the district court ordered that the Old Max facility be closed. However, the execution of the order was temporarily stayed on the condition that the State would take immediate steps to provide the plaintiff class "with the basic human needs" which the court had identified in its opinion, and that the State would present a detailed plan setting forth the means by which it would protect the plaintiff class from further constitutional violations. The State's plan, according to the district court, was to be "in furtherance of, but not necessarily limited to" five enumerated principles — the principles of productive activity, motility, health, integrity and safety, and coherence. Future stays were contingent upon the State's compliance with these conditions. 485 F. Supp. at 169-70.

Subsequently, in denying the State's motion for a stay of execution of the judgment pending an appeal, the court explained its earlier order:

> All that the remedy requires, in essence, is that the state develop its own plans and make good faith immediate and continuing efforts to implement those plans so that the numerous constitutional violations set forth in my memorandum opinion and order will neither be repeated nor advanced.

Id. at 175.

The State argues on this appeal that the district court abused its discretion in its choice of remedy. Specifically it claims that the order of closure was the most intrusive action the court could have taken, that since 1977 it has been moving in a rapid manner to change its prison system, and that since 1978 it has been working according to a five year master plan, introduced into evidence, to ensure that this change will take place in an orderly manner. Brief of Appellants at 141-47.

The Colorado General Assembly, as amicus, states that its good faith efforts to eliminate undesirable prison conditions are well established in the record which shows, according to the amicus, appropriations of nearly $22,500,000 between 1976 and 1979 for the State's prison system, including an allocation of major funds for the construction of an entirely new maximum security and close security facility. The amicus claims that this evidence amply demonstrates that it "has embarked on a plan, which is being funded and implemented, and which will result in the substantial modification of the correctional system in Colorado." Brief of Amicus Curiae at 14-15.

During the oral argument of this appeal, the State claimed that the new prison facility will be completed and occupied within a matter of months. The amicus makes a similar claim in its appellate brief. Reply Brief of Amicus Curiae at 6. In an authorized post-argument response to this contention, the appellees claim that there are conflicting reports on this point and that if "developments in the construction of the new facilities are relevant to the remedy in this case, these developments should be presented in the first instance to the district court." Letter of Appellees' Counsel, filed 6/9/80.

We must agree that the developments in the construction of the new prison facilities are extremely relevant in fashioning an appropriate remedy for the constitutional violations which exist in this case. *See Holt v. Sarver*, 442 F.2d 304, 309 (8th Cir.). And while the scope of a district court's equitable powers to remedy constitutional violations is "broad," *see Hutto v. Finney*, 437 U.S. 678, 687 n.9 we have noted before that the exercise of this power is necessarily tempered by the public interest involved. *See Battle v. Anderson*, 594 F.2d 786, 793 (10th Cir.); *Gates v. Collier*, 407 F. Supp. 1117, 1120-21 (N.D. Miss.).

It is common ground that the State of Colorado has appropriated large amounts of money for the construction of a new correctional facility to accommodate the inmates of Old Max and that this construction has been underway for some

time. *See* I App. Exh. 96-107.[30] The amicus points out that recent legislation has authorized funds for 90 *new* staff positions to coincide with the opening of both the new maximum and the close security facility. The vast majority of these new positions will be used for new security, housing and medical personnel. Reply Brief of Amicus Curiae at 8.

The district court entered its Rule 54(b) order and an immediate appeal of the court's December 1979 order followed. The appeal is now decided in this court, with the rulings on constitutional violations sustained part and vacated in part. However, it is apparent that events have moved forward, that new measures have been taken, and whether the remedial order should stand or be modified should be reconsidered after further proceedings in light of changed conditions and this opinion.

For these reasons we feel that the case should be remanded for the district court to reconsider the proper remedy in light of the present state of conditions, as was done in the *Battle* controversy involving the Oklahoma penitentiary. *See* 594 F.2d 786, 793. On remand the district court should consider, *inter alia*, the present status of the new facility, the specific plans to which the State is committed for the transfer and housing of inmates in the new facilities, the specific commitments for enlarged staff personnel to remedy the deficiencies in personnel that have been found, and the actual progress made in these areas. The district court should conduct any necessary further proceedings for the development of the facts on the status of these matters and on actions required to eradicate the constitutional violations found, with respect to those violations on which the district court's rulings are upheld herein.

---

[30] The district court's opinion in December 1979 referred to the fact that Colorado has appropriated funds to build a new maximum security prison and a new close security prison, and that opening of these facilities is not scheduled until January or February 1981. 485 F. Supp. at 134.

VIII
CONCLUSION

In sum, we hold: (1) that the district court did not err or abuse its discretion in refusing to abstain from deciding the merits of this case; (2) that the district court's findings were not in error as to Eighth Amendment violations at Old Max in the areas of shelter, sanitation, food, safety, and medical care and in the finding of a violation of the inmates' constitutional right of access to the courts, due to the inadequate law library facilities and the restricted access permitted to them; (3) that the provisions of the district court's remedial order on motility, classification, and idleness, are vacated, as provided in Part III A, *supra;* (4) that the findings and judgment holding unconstitutional the prison's visitation regulations and policies are vacated; (5) that the ruling holding invalid and unenforceable four of the restrictions on inmates' correspondence was not in error and is sustained; and (6) that the remedial order is vacated and the cause remanded for further proceedings and reconsideration as provided above, except with respect to the portions of the order on health care, which shall remain in effect until the district court's reconsideration and entry of any new order thereon.

Accordingly, the district court's findings and conclusions are affirmed in part and set aside in part; the district court's remedial order is vacated in part; and the cause is remanded for further proceedings, all in accord with this opinion.

OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO DATED DECEMBER 20, 1979

PREVIOUS PAGE WAS BLANK

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

FIDEL RAMOS, DAVID LEE ANDERSON, SADIKI LISIMBA AJAMU (a/k/a Eugene Collins), ALEXANDER ROSES, MARK J. MENCHETTI and LESTER LAZENBY, et al.,	)	Civil Action No. 77-K-1093
Plaintiffs,	)	
vs.	)	MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER
RICHARD D. LAMM, ALLEN L. AULT, JOHN PERKO, EDGAR FOX AND WILLIAM WILSON	)	
Defendants.	)	

JAMES E. HARTLEY and HUGH Q. GOTTSCHALK, Attorneys at law, appearing on behalf of The ACLU Foundation of Colorado, Inc., P.O. Box 8749, Denver, Colorado 80201; and

PEGGY A. WIESENBERG and RALPH I. KNOWLES, JR., Attorneys at law, appearing on behalf of The National Prison Project, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1031, Washington, D.C. 20036; attorneys for plaintiffs.

JOSEPH N. de RAISMES, First Assistant Attorney General, RICHARD H. GOLDBERG, JEFFREY WEINMAN, and MAUREEN PHELAN, Assistant Attorneys General, Office of the Attorney General, 1525 Sherman Street, 3rd Floor, Denver, Colorado 80203, attorneys for defendants.

PREVIOUS PAGE WAS BLANK

KANE, District Judge

This action is a suit under 42 U.S.C. §1983[1] challenging conditions of confinement at the maximum security unit of the Colorado State Penitentiary at Canon City, Colorado. Plaintiffs are persons incarcerated in this maximum security unit, and defendants include the governor of Colorado, the executive director of the Department of Corrections, and the superintendent of the maximum security unit. The suit was filed *in forma pauperis* on November 30, 1977. After appearance of counsel for plaintiffs and amendment of their complaint, the suit was certified as a class action on March 31, 1978, pursuant to F.R.Civ.P. Rule 23. The class consists of all persons who are now or in the future may be incarcerated in the maximum security unit, or the new maximum or close security unit, of the Colorado Department of Corrections.

On May 17, 1978, a motion to dismiss, or in the alternative to abstain, was denied, and defendants answered the amended complaint on June 9, 1978. After a year and a half of discovery and months of effort to reach a settlement, the pretrial order was filed. On October 5, 1979, the eleventh hour before trial, the Honorable Richard D. Lamm, Governor of Colorado, filed a letter with the court concerning the parties' efforts to reach a settlement. In the letter Governor Lamm detailed the unsuccessful efforts made to bring the various constituencies of the state government into consensus and requested an additional one week's continuance of the trial date in order to further these efforts. The request was granted. In part of his letter, Governor Lamm stated, "I understand that the parties must prepare for trial, but it is my earnest hope that a consensus can be reached before

---

[1] This statute was passed by Congress on April 20, 1871 and provides as follows:

> "Every person who, under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage of any State or Territory, subjects or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress."

Jurisdiction is provided at 28 U.S.C. §1343(3).

trial, one way or another. I believe that an agreement negotiated by the parties in good faith in this matter should be given a chance to succeed, which it can if there is a legislative consensus in support of it. But I cannot agree to the document which I have reviewed absent such a consensus, and I do not believe that it would be in the interest of the court or the parties for me to do so." Trial began on October 15, 1979 and lasted for five weeks. Testimony from inmates, state officials and numerous experts was received. Thousands of pages of documentary evidence were received, and a firsthand inspection of the prison was made. After eight hours of final arguments a bench ruling was made in favor of plaintiffs holding that the conditions at the Canon Correctional Facility deprive persons incarcerated there of rights clearly protected by the United States Constitution and violate numerous rules of state law. This opinion supplants the bench ruling.

THE CONTEXT OF JUDICIAL DETERMINATION

Across the country, civil rights cases filed by state prisoners in federal courts have increased from 2,030 in 1970 to 11,195 in 1979, an increase of 451.5 per cent. ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS, 1979 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR 59-62 (1979).[2] In the District of Colorado, for the twelve month period ending June 30, 1979, 155 civil rights cases were commenced by state prisoners, compared to 106 in 1978, 51 in 1977, and only 21 in 1976.[3] This represents an increase of 50 per cent since 1978, and almost 750 per cent since 1970. As of June 30, 1979, 115 such cases were pending in this district, compared to only 65 as of the same time in 1978.[4]

---

[2] For a study of state prisoner civil rights actions, *see* Turner, *When Prisoners Sue: A Study of Prisoner Section 1983 Suits in the Federal Courts*, 92 Harv. L. Rev. 610 (1979).

[3] ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS, 1979, 1978, 1977 and 1976 ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE DIRECTOR.

[4] 1979 and 1978 ANNUAL REPORTS, at A-23 and A-25, respectively.

From the Colorado State Penitentiary alone, 150 civil rights cases have been filed since 1976. Of these 150, 84 were dismissed and two others were decided in favor of defendant state officials.[5] In comparison, in only four cases was there any disposition, preliminary or otherwise, in favor of plaintiff inmates. Two cases are on appeal, nine have been stayed or consolidated with this action, 39 others are pending, and ten have had assorted histories. Of the 92 case dispositions, 86 were either dismissed or decided in favor of state officials, accounting for more than 93 per cent of the results. Such a history hardly indicates that the federal judiciary has jumped at the chance to interpose itself between Colorado officials and persons confined at the State penitentiary. The contrary is true.

A great deal of this deference to state officials has been due to the substantial reluctance of federal courts to intervene in matters of prison administration. For many years, the so-called "hands off" policy was a near absolute jurisdictional bar to federal court review of alleged violations of prisoners' asserted constitutional rights. Language from the Tenth Circuit is suggestive of the attitude that "[c]ourts are without power to supervise prison administration or to interfere with the ordinary prison rules or regulations." *Banning v. Looney*, 213 F.2d 771, 771 (10th Cir. 1954), *cert. denied*, 348 U.S. 859 (1954). *See Stroud v. Swope*, 187 F.2d 850, 851 (9th Cir. 1951), *cert. denied*, 342 U.S. 829 (1951); *Garcia v. Steele*, 193 F.2d 276, 278 (8th Cir. 1951); and *Dayton v. Hunter*, 176 F.2d 108, 109 (10th Cir. 1949), *cert. denied*, 388 U.S. 888 (1950).[6] With *Cooper v. Pate*, 378 U.S. 546 (1964) (per curiam), however, the courts began to open their doors to prisoner complaints. In *Cooper*, a state prisoner alleged that he was denied religious freedom and dis-

---

[5] Nationwide, of the 10,301 state prisoner civil rights actions disposed of during the twelve month period ending June 30, 1979, 9,526, or 92.47 per cent, were disposed of before pretrial, and only 358, or 3.47 per cent, went to trial. 1979 ANNUAL REPORT, at A-30 — A-31.

[6] For a history and discussion of the "hands off" doctrine, *see* Note, *Beyond the Ken of the Courts: A Critique of Judicial Refusal to Review the Complaints of Convicts*, 72 Yale L. J. 506 (1963); Comment, *Constitutional Rights of Prisoners: The Developing Law*, 110 U. Pa. L. Rev. 985 (1962).

criminated against in his religious practice. The Seventh Circuit affirmed the district court's dismissal:

> 'We think that it is well settled that it is not the function of the courts to superintend the treatment and discipline of prisoners in penitentiaries, but only to deliver from imprisonment those who are illegally confined.' Stroud v. Swope, Warden, 9 Cir., 187 F.2d 850, 851. A prisoner may not approve of prison rules and regulations, but under all ordinary circumstances that is no basis for coming into a federal court seeking relief even though he may claim that the restrictions placed upon his activities are in violation of his constitutional rights. [Citations omitted.]

324 F.2d 165, 167 (7th Cir. 1963) (quoting *United States ex rel. Morris v. Radio Station WENR*, 209 F.2d 105, 107 (7th Cir. 1953)). On certiorari, the Supreme Court reversed. "Taking as true the allegations of the complaints, as they must be on a motion to dismiss, the complaint stated a cause of action and it was error to dismiss it." *Cooper v. Pate*, 378 U.S. at 546.

By 1972, the Supreme Court said in *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319, 321-22 (1972) (per curiam):

> Federal courts sit not to supervise prisons but to enforce the constitutional rights of all 'persons', including prisoners. We are not unmindful that prison officials must be accorded latitude in the administration of prison affairs, and that prisoners necessarily are subject to appropriate rules and regulations. But persons in prison, like other individuals, have the right to petition the Government for redress of grievances which, of course, includes 'access of prisoners to the courts for the purpose of presenting their complaints.' Johnson v. Avery, 393 US 483, 485, 21 L Ed 2d 718, 721, 89 S Ct 747; Ex parte Hull, 312 US 546, 549, 85 L Ed 1034, 1035, 61 S Ct 640.

The court reversed the lower courts' dismissal and granted petitioner's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

The Tenth Circuit followed suit in *Bethea v. Crouse*, 417 F.2d 504 (10th Cir. 1969). Discussing its past dealings with prisoner complaints, the Court of Appeals stated at 505-06 (emphasis added):

> We have consistently adhered to the so-called "hands off" policy in matters of prison administration according to which we have said that the basic responsibility for the control and management of penal institutions, including the discipline, treatment, and care of those confined, lies with the responsible administrative agency and is not subject to judicial review unless exercised in such a manner as to constitute clear abuse or caprice upon the part of prison officials. See Graham v. Willingham, 384 F.2d 367 (10th Cir. 1967). Also see Banning v. Looney, 213 F.2d 771 (10th Cir. 1954; Powell v. Hunter, 172 F.2d 330 (10th Cir. 1949). *But being fulling cognizant that one does not lose all his constitutional rights when he enters a prison*, see Cooper v. Pate, 378 U.S. 546, . . . , *we have never turned a deaf ear to a bona fide claim for relief based upon the deprivation of a constitutional right* when asserted by a federal or state prisoner, either in the nature of a mandamus or habeas corpus proceeding, or, as here, a claim under the Civil Rights Act.

Accord, Gregory v. Wyse, 512 F.2d 378, 381 (10th Cir. 1975), *Dearman v. Woodson*, 429 F.2d 1288, 1290 (10th Cir. 1970). In *Crouse*, inmates at the Kansas State Penitentiary complained, *inter alia*, that prison officials had stood by and not intervened when plaintiffs were assaulted by another inmate. The district court had granted summary judgment in favor of the warden, and the court of appeals reversed, finding that summary judgment was not appropriate. 417 F.2d at 507-10.

Defendants have pointed to several recent Supreme Court decisions which reiterate the policy of substantial deference to prison officials. *See Bell v. Wolfish*, ____ U.S. ____, 99 S.Ct. 1861, 60 L.Ed.2d 447 (1979); *Jones v. North Carolina Prisoners' Union, Inc.*, 433 U.S. 119 (1977); and *Procunier v. Martinez*, 416 U.S. 396 (1974). I have read these

decisions and, to the extent that they are relevant, I am bound by them. In fact, I have consistently followed this policy. *See Jackson v. Moore*, 471 F. Supp. 1068 (1979); *Marioneaux v. Colorado State Penitentiary*, 465 F. Supp. 1245 (1979); *Tuggle v. Evans*, 457 F. Supp. 1015 (1978); *Mingo v. Patterson*, 455 F. Supp. 1358 (1978); *Sorenson v. Zapien*, 455 F. Supp. 1207 (1978); and *Brown v. McCowen*, 445 F. Supp. 468 (1978). But it is always the countervailing principle, in these decisions and others, that "a policy of judicial restraint cannot encompass any failure to take cognizance of valid constitutional claims whether arising in a federal or state institution. When a prison regulation or practice offends a fundamental constitutional guarantee, federal courts will discharge their duty to protect constitutional rights." *Procunier v. Martinez*, 416 U.S. at 405-06. As the Tenth Circuit said in *Battle v. Anderson*, 564 F.2d 388, 392-93 (10th Cir. 1977):

> We, too, abhor any situation or circumstances requiring the intervention of the federal courts in matters involving the administration, control and maintenance by the sovereign states of their penal systems. It is a delicate role assigned to the federal courts to display that restraint so necessary 'in the maintenance of proper federal-state relations.' *Townsend v. Sain*, 372 U.S. 293, 83 S.Ct. 745, 9 L.Ed.2d 770 (1963). We are cognizant of the complexity of problems confronting the states in upgrading not only a host of state institutions and facilities but in properly maintaining them both physically and with adequate personnel. If we were to close our eyes to the financial burdens a variety of 'piecemeal' federal court orders would impose upon the states and their taxpayers we would refuse to come to grips with reality. We are in sympathy with the ever increasing budgetary demands upon state taxpayers. There are constitutional and statutory limits on a state's capacity to finance capital outlays. No one state governmental body is authorized to dictate a specific course of action. The governmental wheels often turn slowly simply as a result of pressure generated by a multitude of needs. Those charged with the administration of state government must pick and choose, set

priorities and goals, many of which must later be abandoned or delayed because of unforeseen emergencies. Thus, it is in recognition of these problems and pressures that this court is sincerely reluctant to enter the arena involving the issues presented. The fact is, however, that the *issues* are jurisdictionally before us, just as they were jurisdictionally before the District Court. They have not been invited or solicited. *We are guided by the fact that the United States Supreme Court has not wavered in its holding that the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibiting the imposition of cruel and unusual punishment is, inter alia, intended to protect and safeguard a prison inmate from an environment where degeneration is probable and self-improvement unlikely because of the conditions existing which inflict needless suffering, whether physical or mental. Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 S.Ct. 285, 50 L.Ed. 2d 251 (1976); *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153, 96 S.Ct. 2909, 49 L.Ed.2d 859 (1976). [Emphasis added.]

As I have stated in my bench ruling, there is, from the beginning of my assignment to this case to the present time, a complete and utter distaste for having to cross that Rubicon which separates the federal government from the state government. In addition to the cited decisions, the history which I have recounted shows that this circuit and district have shown great deference to prison officials, especially toward the Colorado State Penitentiary and the 150 cases that have been filed from there in the past three years. Nevertheless, the plaintiffs have presented substantial, often compelling, evidence of long existing and continuing constitutional violations. Except in fashioning the necessary relief, deference is no longer possible.

JURISDICTION

It is a well-settled rule that civil rights plaintiffs are not required to exhaust state remedies before seeking relief in federal court. *See Wilwording v. Swenson*, 404 U.S. 249 (1971) (per curiam); *King v. Smith*, 392 U.S. 309 (1968); *Houghton v. Shafer*, 392 U.S. 309 (1968) (per curiam; *Dami-*

co v. California, 389 U.S. 416 (1967) (per curiam); *McNeese v. Board of Education*, 373 U.S. 668 (1963); *Monroe v. Pape*, 365 U.S. 167 (1961). *Accord, Clappier v. Flynn*, 605 F.2d 519, 526 (10th Cir. 1979). *Wilwording* is particularly relevant since in that case state prisoners complained of conditions of confinement in the maximum security unit of the Missouri State Penitentiary. The complaint was fashioned as a petition for habeas corpus and both the district court and the Eighth Circuit dismissed the petition for failure to exhaust state remedies. 404 U.S. at 249. After stating that "[s]ection 2254 does not erect insuperable or successive barriers to the invocation of federal habeas corpus," *id.* at 250, the court said that the prisoners' *pro se* complaint could "also be read to plead causes of action under the Civil Rights Act." *Id.* at 251. The court continued:

> Petitioners were therefore entitled to have their actions treated as claims for relief under the Civil Rights Acts, not subject, on the basis of their allegations, to exhaustion requirements. The remedy provided by these Acts 'is supplementary to the state remedy, and the latter need not be first sought and refused before the federal one is invoked.' Monroe v. Pape, 365 US 167, 183, 5 L Ed 2d 492, 503, 81 S Ct 473 (1961); McNeese v. Board of Education, 373 US 668, 10 L Ed 2d 622, 83 S Ct 1433 (1963); Damico v. California, 389 US 416, 19 L Ed 2d 647, 88 S Ct 526 (1967). State prisoners are not held to any stricter standard of exhaustion than other civil rights plaintiffs. Houghton v. Shafer, 392 US 639, 20 L Ed 2d 1319, 88 S Ct 2119 (1968).

The rule is applicable here.[7]

---

[7] Several lower courts have attempted to establish an exhaustion requirement in prisoner civil rights litigation but have been reversed by the courts of appeal. *See McCray v. Burrell*, 367 F.Supp. 1191 (D. Md. 1973), *rev'd*, 516 F.2d 357 (4th Cir. 1975), *cert. dismissed as improvidently granted*, 426 U.S. 471 (1976) (per curiam); *Hardwick v. Ault*, 517 F.2d 295 (5th Cir. 1975). *McCray* provided the Supreme Court with an express opportunity to require that state prisoners exhaust state remedies before seeking federal civil rights relief, but the court dismissed its writ of certiorari as improvidently granted, 426 U.S. at 471, after the issue had been briefed and argued on its merits. Four members of the court nonetheless expressed agreement with the Fourth Circuit's decision that exhaustion is not required. *Id.* at 471-75.

FINDINGS OF FACT

In Appendix I (Revised) to the Pre-Trial Orders there are 1,727 separate, numbered paragraphs containing stipulations and proposed stipulations of fact, excerpts of sworn testimony and summaries of statistics. Some of these paragraphs contain subheadings and, in their entirety, the data covers 229 pages. During trial, thirty-six additional witnesses were offered and received. Over four hundred exhibits were received. It would be pointless to set forth all of this evidence in detail. With only two obvious exceptions, the testimony was credible and largely uncontradicted.

As will be stated more explicitly, the evidence in this case shows that prisoners in the Canon Correctional Facility are housed under conditions which fall below all recognized constitutional and professional standards. Those conditions include insufficient living space with inadequate sanitation, ventilation, light, heat, noise control and fire safety; lack of protection from violence; massive and pervasive idleness because of lack of productive activity; inadequate medical care (both mental and physical); and unnecessarily restrictive classification of prisoners into security classifications which exacerbate physical and mental deterioration.

The old maximum security prison of Colorado ("Old Max") began as a territorial prison back in the late 1860's before Colorado became a state. For the most part, Old Max was built in the early part of this century. With the exception of the new administration building, the prison is antiquated and shows scars left by generations of neglect.

Every report which has been issued in the last ten years has decried the inadequate facilities and sporadic rehabilitation at Old Max. The institution has been studied to death.

In 1973, a task force from the American Correctional Association found that Old Max was an "outdated, unmanageable facility" which could not be efficiently staffed due to its design. A year and a half later, the report by the Attorney General to defendant Lamm on the events and causes of the May 18, 1975 riot found that Old Max was "antiquated" and "insecure" and recommended studying the possibility of raz-

ing the cellhouses or gutting their interiors in their entirety. In February 1977, the Corrections Master Plan which was submitted to defendant Lamm and the Colorado State Legislature recommended that Old Max be phased out as a prison. Its use as a medium security prison was considered and rejected.

In February, 1978, the Department of Corrections commissioned yet another master plan. A consultant familiar with reuse and modification of existing correctional facilities, whom the Department of Corrections hired to study Old Max, found that with the exception of the new administrative building, all other facilities at Old Max, including the perimeter wall should be demolished or otherwise decommissioned so that inmates will not be housed or employed in those buildings. At the time of this study, the Department of Corrections supported demolition of all buildings at Old Max except the administration building. Paul Silver, a nationally recognized corrections architect hired by the defendants, has stated that each and every major living area at Old Max is unfit for human habitation.

Although Colorado has appropriated funds to build a new maximum security prison and a new close security prison, these facilities are not scheduled to be opened until January or February 1981. In the interim, prisoners are forced to live in intolerable conditions at Old Max.

Old Max was built over the years in a random fashion on a site stepping up a steep "hogback" hill at the west end of Canon City. Buildings, fences, walls and towers have been added over the years without an overall plan for development.

Due to its haphazard evolution, Old Max is a collection of unmanageable and unsecurable building components. A relatively new administration building and diagnostic center front the public road and form the outer facade of the prison. Behind the walls, the prison consists of three large cellblocks — 1, 3, and 7. The central building which houses the school, auditorium, law library, main kitchen, dining rooms, and a few offices is part of the same building that

houses cellhouse 1. The prison infirmary which serves all 3 prisons in Canon City is located deep within the Old Max complex near cellhouse 3. In the basement of the infirmary there is a small housing unit known as cellhouse 5 for "trusty" prisoners; upstairs is a clutch of carrels for the tiny and wholly inadequate mental health department. Beyond the North Wall is a small industry row. Outside the walls on the east side of the prison is a small obsolete building known as cellhouse 4 which originally was used as the Colorado Women's prison and is now used to house minimum security prisoners assigned to Old Max.

The main living areas of Old Max are unfit for human habitation. Housing facilities are totally obsolete and do not comply with minimal architectural standards. Cellhouses 1 and 7 house approximately 800 prisoners in high multi-storied open tiers. Each cellhouse consists of 2 concrete cell-blocks, with 4 tiers of cells back to back in 2 parallel rows with an open gallery between them. There is no room for prisoners to move. Most cells provide for barely one half the square footage of space required by modern correctional standards.[8] Tiers are narrow and floor space is limited. As a result, prisoners live with constant jostling in very restricted space.

At one point, Colorado planned to tear down cellhouse 7. As recently as 1975, it was closed. However, after the May 1975 riot, cellhouse 7 was reopened so prisoners could escape the overcrowded conditions which existed in cellhouse 1.[9] Now the population in those cellhouses has increased.

Cellhouse 3 consists of 100 segregation cells in a concrete building with 10 separate wings for prisoners. It has two floors. Each floor has 2 wings of interior cells back to back. In addition, cellhouse 3 has 6 maximum isolation cells known as "the hole" on the bottom floor behind the officer

---

[8] In cellhouse 7, most cells are 31.5 square feet. In cellhouse 1, cells are 35 square feet.

[9] In May of 1975, the population in cellhouse 1 was 357 and the Attorney General's Investigation found that prisoners, line officers and administrators all agreed that it had to be drastically reduced.

control cage and a similar wing upstairs for death row. There is a special section on the second floor known to the staff as the "intensive management unit" and to the prisoners as the "dog cages." Both terms are accurate. Prisoners in cellhouse 3 are locked in their cells an average of 23 hours a day. The cells do not provide the 80 square feet required for prisoners in segregated status by the American Correction Association or the 60 square feet accepted by *Battle v. Anderson.*

Environmentally Old Max is inadequate to meet the health and safety needs of prisoners in the correctional system. Buildings are in a serious state of disrepair. The roof in cellhouse 1 has been leaking in the south, north and front sections for several months. Previous repairs were ineffective. The roof in cellhouse 3 is deteriorated and has also been leaking over a major portion of the cellhouse.

Plumbing throughout Old Max is unsanitary, inadequate and poses an imminent danger to public health. Cellhouse 3 does not have hot water, even though minimum standards for correctional institutions require hot water as a fundamental health measure. Cellhouses 1 and 7 cells now have hot water.

Throughout the institution, there are leaking water pipes. In cellhouse 7, continuing problems with leaking plumbing have caused leaks into adjacent and lower cells. Moreover, malfunctioning toilets and deficient venting of the plumbing system have caused sewage to drain into sinks in adjacent and lower cells.

Shower areas have not been maintained in clean, sanitary and safe condition. Bath water has been impounded in shower drains and troughs due to obstructed drains. Excessive moisture, humidity and overgrowths of mold, fungus and slime have resulted from inadequate ventilation. Missing ceramic floor tiles have made floors uncleanable and promote mold and slime buildup. The unsanitary conditions present a source of infection from fungal buildup and a hazard to users due to metal stubs sticking up through the floor and uncovered electrical boxes that are sources for electrical shock. In cellhouse 3, one inmate was burned on

the arms, hands, neck, back and face by being exposed to excessively hot water in the shower; his injuries required plastic surgery.

The heating and ventilation system are antiquated and incapable of providing minimally adequate heat and ventilation. Cellhouses 1 and 7 have open 5-6 story interiors with two four-tier islands of cells surrounded by glass windows around the entire building perimeter. This design precludes the elimination of drafts, the adequate control of tempera ures, and the even circulation of air. State health inspections have consistently cited extreme temperature variations between the first and fourth tiers. Ventilation equipment is frequently not in use. During the summer months, odors, excessive heat, and humidity are unbearable on the upper tiers. The lack of adequate ventilation causes stagnant air with foul odors; the continued presence of contaminants in the air; a lack of adequate displacement of body heat; personal discomfort; health and sanitary problems and an increase in frustration, stress and hostility among prisoners and staff. The ventilation systems in cellhouses 1, 3 and 7 cannot be upgraded to meet minimum standards without major alterations of the ventilation systems and buildings at uneconomical expense.

The noise levels in the living areas of Old Max are intolerable. Large and old cellblocks with large vaulted spaces, tremendous physical distances, open tiers, hard surfaces, and an absence of acoustical equipment create serious and harmful noise level problems. There is a direct correlation between high noise levels and high blood pressure, hypertension, nervousness, stress, loss of appetite and detrimental psychological effect. No measures have been taken to control or abate noise in any area of Old Max.

Lighting is inadequate for prisoners to read safely in their cells. Minimum standards require 30 foot candles; ordinary lighting for book reading should be 60-80 foot candles by architectural standards. Readings at Old Max for March, June and July 1979 showed lighting was only 10 foot candles. The cell lights by design are inadequate and impracticable for lighting purposes involving close eye tasks.

Inadequate lighting has adverse effects on vision; moreover, insufficient lighting increases tension and fatigue among prisoners and guards.

The entire institution is a fire hazard. In the event of fire in old multi-tiered facilitities like cellhouses 1 and 7, it is impossible to evacuate prisoners. Cellblocks are not divided into compartmentalized fire zones. There are neither smoke barriers nor smoke detectors. Twenty-four hour surveillance by guards is relied upon for fire detection, and fire fighting. Even the hospital has dead end corridors which present serious barriers to evacuation in case of emergency. The institution has been cited for numerous violations of the National Fire Protection Association Standards.

Conditions in the food services areas at Old Max and the Diagnostic Unit fail to meet any known public health standards. The building housing the main kitchen is obsolete; in October 1978 the Department of Corrections determined that major structural improvements were not economically feasible. Walls are soiled with dirt. The wall tile throughout the main kitchen is not readily cleanable because of recessed grouting. Concrete floor areas have deteriorated and are not readily cleanable. Ventilation is inadequate throughout the main kitchen. The fan in the kitchen is ineffective and causes dust and lint to be blown over the food preparation area. Two barely functioning floor drains serve the entire kitchen. Excessive water collects around steam kettles, dishwashers, and the produce processing area. Storage shelves have been soiled with dirt. Rodent droppings have been found in the storeroom. Equipment is outdated and poorly arranged.

Inspections by the Colorado State Health Department have revealed persistent violations of health codes. As of July 17, 1979, the State Department of Health could not issue a Certificate of Inspection for the food service facilities because the facilities were not in substantial compliance with the "Rules and Regulations Governing the Sanitation of Food Service Establishments in the State of Colorado." Although some deficiencies were clearly laid to the outdated equipment and facilities, most deficiencies were caused by a

lack of routine maintenance, operational and cleaning procedures. These unsanitary conditions have a direct impact on the health of the inmate population.

Many health and sanitation deficiencies at Old Max are the result of a lack of routine maintenance and cleaning programs. The present executive director, James Ricketts, is a professed stickler for cleanliness. Under his administration, a significant increase in cleaning activity has taken place but the facilities are still below standard. Poor housekeeping practices have been prevalent throughout the institution. Inspection after inspection cites cellhouses, corridors, and cells that are littered with trash and an accumulation of decayed food and other materials. As of July 1979, general repair and maintenance work at the prison was not being handled in a prompt and responsive manner by the industries division thus resulting in delays in repairs to plumbing, lighting and electrical systems.

Every expert who has examined Old Max has concluded that it would be both infeasible and uneconomical to renovate Old Max for continued use. Defendant, former Executive Director Ault, has stated that many health and safety deficiencies at Old Max are virtually impossible to correct because of inherently deficient design and construction. As of February 1, 1977, it would have cost at least 38 million dollars to make Old Max minimally habitable. Even if defendants were to upgrade individual buildings to minimize environmental health deficiencies, the design and layout of Old Max make it virtually impossible for officials to provide prisoners with adequate programming.

There is inadequate space at Old Max for programs and what space is provided is poorly designed. In order to prevent debilitation of prisoners, housing units must include adequate space for outdoor recreation, indoor recreation, lounge space and private activity spaces. Yet none of the major housing units at Old Max have day rooms, activity space or private conference areas. The random layout of buildings limits spaces available for programmed recreation. Moreover, the mazelike design and disorganized layout of the prison dictate a disproportionate amount of staff time to security and monitoring traffic. Staff are not available to oversee programs and activities. Former Director Ault recog-

nized that the limitations of the 100 year old prison would make it difficult for the Department of Corrections to implement Colorado laws which require all inmates to work.

The most serious defect in the design of Old Max, however, is the inherent inability to provide prisoners with basic safety. The American Correctional Association report, the Attorney General's report, the 1977 Master Plan and the Five Year Correctional Plan all found that the design of the prison makes it virtually impossible to provide prisoners with security. The haphazard growth of the institution and the nature of the site do not permit adequate surveillance.

Due to inadequate planning and design, the prison cannot be staffed efficiently to provide for security. So many walls and fences have been constructed within the perimeter of Old Max, it takes a disproportionate amount of staff to man the security towers; it is necessary to man 10 towers around the clock, to provide what is less than adequate surveillance. Because buildings, yards and walls have developed in a random fashion, inmate traffic around the prison is congested and confused. Moreover, there are a large number of blind spots which permit assaults and violent incidents to occur out of the sight of correctional officers. There are so many niches and crannies which are hidden from visibility at Old Max that officials have restricted prisoner movement and the use of outdoor space.

The cellhouses do not provide for safety. Housing contributes to violence between inmates often leading to severe injury and death. The design of cellhouses 1 and 7 fails to provide for visibility. The guards' cage at the far end of the cellhouse is inadequate for surveillance. There is no secure vantage point from which cell movement can be observed. Visual surveillance of the upper tier cells and most of the tiers is obstructed from the ground floor. Similarly, cellhouse 3 has 10 separate wings for housing prisoners. This design does not allow for visual surveillance and observation from the central control cage.

Old Max fails to meet life safety codes, building codes, health codes, fire safety codes, or other regulations relating to the safety of inmates and staff.

IDLENESS

Old Max is characterized by massive and pervasive idleness. Although the defendants have been aware of the problem of idleness for years, nothing has been done to alleviate the dead time and boredom which dominate the lives of most prisoners at Old Max. In recent years, actions have been taken to restrict rather than to increase activity at the prison. No substantial effort has been made to increase jobs or programs or activities at Old Max nor are there any developed plans or funds for jobs, programs, activities or staff at the new prisons.

In 1973, the American Correctional Association found that idleness was responsible for more problems at Old Max than any other factor. Similarly, the report of the Attorney General on the events and causes of the May 18, 1975 riot at the Colorado State Penitentiary concluded that "there is too much 'dead' time during which inmates have no effective opportunity to engage in productive activity," and that "more work and recreation programs are needed."

While fully cognizant of these reports, prison officials began to restrict productive activity at Old Max. After 1975, officials tore down a substantial portion of industry row along the north wall eliminating the cannery, mattress factory, brick plant, shoe shop, butcher shop, tin shop, garbage shop, soap plant, blacksmith shop and tailor shop. For totally unexplained reasons, inmates do not even remove trash and garbage. Such removal is performed by an outside contractor. In 1977, after Allen Ault became Director, officials tore down the laundry which employed over 50 prisoners. In 1977, the officials tore down the general library and stopped providing any library services or books to prisoners. In 1976, the Warden of Old Max, after consultation with Governor Lamm, discontinued a number of inmate self-help groups at Old Max, including the Black Cultural Development Society, the Latin American Development Society, the Progressors, each of whose membership ranged from 100-200 prisoners. In 1977, officials discontinued the Alcoholics Anonymous Study Group which involved 234 prisoners. Later, the officials banned the inmate council and discontinued the inmate radio station and the inmate newspaper. None of these jobs or activities has been reinstated or replaced.

The majority of prisoners at Old Max are unemployed. Such unemployed inmates in the general population are referred to as "transitional workers" or "TWs." These prisoners are eligible for jobs but are not assigned only because there are no jobs available. Even though TWs are not so assigned for disciplinary violations, they are forced to remain in their cells at least 20 hours a day. Not only are they denied employment opportunities, but because they are not workers, they are denied access to any constructive or productive activities such as hobbies or crafts and drug and alcohol treatment groups. Essentially, they are subject to double punishment because no jobs are provided.

Over a hundred prisoners at Old Max are confined in protective custody to escape the violent and unsafe conditions in the general population. They are there for their own safety, not because of misconduct. Even so, they are locked in their cells for at least 20 hours a day, and allowed to leave only for meals and showers, and for recreation twice a week. Prison rules deny them the opportunity to participate in employment, education, drug treatment programs, hobby activities and religious programs. In recent months they have had to forego one of the opportunities for recreation in order to go to the canteen.

One of the nation's leading experts in the field of corrections, John P. Conrad, testified that an excessive number of prisoners in protective custody is an indication of improper administration and inadequate staff. There is no legitimate penological reason for denying these inmates access to jobs and other constructive activity. The only reason for their forced idleness is that there is inadequate staff to provide protection outside the cells. That so many inmates are willing to endure these conditions is an indication of the level of concern for personal safety.

In short, many prisoners at Old Max are locked in their cells for more than 20 hours a day. Largely because of inadequate resources, prison rules and regulations severely restrict the opportunity of many inmates to participate in the few programs which do exist. The result is clear: only a small number of inmates are involved in programs and the rest spend their days confined in their cells with nothing constructive to do.

ISOLATION

A large number of prisoners are subjected to long-term isolation under oppressive conditions of confinement. In cellhouse 3, prisoners are locked in their cells for more than 22 hours a day. They are not let out of their cells for daily showers or daily exercise. They are prohibited from participation in all programs. They are not allowed out of their cells for meals. Inmates in cellhouse 3 are denied the most rudimentary opportunity for human contact: treatment staff rarely come to cellhouse 3 and the three guards who are assigned to the cellblock rarely enter the cellblock areas to talk to prisoners.

Many prisoners are placed in cellhouse 3 for administrative reasons, not for punishment. Nonetheless, all prisoners in cellhouse 3, even those who are there because of serious mental problems, are treated in the same harsh and restrictive manner as those are being punished. While punitive segregation is limited to specific lengths of time, administrative segregation is not. The total lack of activity in cellhouse 3 increases frustration and stress and causes mental and physical deterioration.

Defendants have done little or nothing to reduce the large numbers of prisoners in administrative segregation or to create opportunities for constructive activity. In fact, the number of inmates in administrative segregation has increased to the point that a second unit has been created in cellhouse 7.

EMPLOYMENT

The State of Colorado has placed a clear statutory duty on the defendants to "assume responsibility for training offenders in general work habits, work skills, and specific training skills that increase their employment prospects when released," "to develop industries that provide forty hours of work activity each week for all able-bodied offenders," and "to provide an environment for the operation of correctional industries that closely resembles the environment for the business operations of a private, corporate entity." C.R.S., § 17-24-102 (a) (b) (c) (d) (1978).

Despite this duty, the majority of prisoners at Old Max do not participate in work and training programs. On July 1, 1978, less than ¼ of the prisoners at Max (206 out of the 847 prisoners) were assigned to jobs. As of June 4, 1979, nearly 400 prisoners were completely idle.

The industries program does not have sufficient staff to operate. Even though Old Max houses half of the prisoners who are incarcerated in the Colorado prison system, the Department has assigned only 13 of its 167 correctional industries staff to the production industries program at Old Max. Staff shortages have adversely affected prisoners in working status since staff cutbacks have resulted in prisoners spending more idle time in their cells.

There are very few production shops at Old Max. The shops which exist — tag plant, sign shop, print shop, machine shop, carpentry/furniture shop — employ few prisoners. Other jobs are primarily maintenance, clerical and "porter" jobs which do not keep prisoners busy and do not develop job skills. Industrial shops at Old Max are limited by a lack of qualified and trained personnel, old equipment which frequently breaks down, a lack of materials and a lack of stock and inventory. None of the industries shops offer journeyman or trade certificates. Not all shop supervisors are certified as vocational training instructors.

Defendants have not made any significant effort to create new industrial jobs for prisoners at Old Max. In the last three years, defendants have started only one new shop. Only two prisoners have been assigned to this shop since it opened. There is no formal follow-up to see if prisoners employed in prison industries are actually placed in private industry upon release.

There is little or no systematic training oriented to employment and no indication of joint planning and program development between correctional industries, vocational education and academic education. There is no overall program of vocational education and on-the-job training which extends from the classroom through work release opportunities and parole. There is no vocational training offered.

As previously stated, prisoners who are unemployed because no jobs are available are denied opportunities to participate in other productive activities because they are not employed. Unemployed or under-employed prisoners increase security problems for the staff. Gambling, alcohol and drug abuse, and fights fill the void created by the idleness.

Unemployment and idleness could become even worse at the new facilities. There are presently no firm plans for industry programs at New Max. The Department does not plan to move the existing tag plant, sign shop, print shop, machine/welding shop or the furniture shop to New Max. The Department intends to keep industry row at Old Max operating until the shops generate enough profit to support construction of industrial shops at New Max. However, the Department does not plan to permit prisoners at New Max or the new close security prison to be transported to Old Max to work in the interim. The Department estimates that at least a third of the prisoners at New Max will be ineligible for jobs, and that another third will be in protective custody. Jobs have not been developed for those in protective custody, although there has been some mention of possible "cottage industries" for such inmates. It has also not developed enough jobs for those prisoners at Old Max who are expected to move to the new close security prison.

EDUCATION

Department statistics indicate that 75-85% of the prisoners at the penitentiary lack a high school diploma. The average reading level of prisoners is 7th-8th grade level. Nonetheless, educational programs at Old Max are totally inadequate. Education has no priority in the Department of Corrections. The education department is most conspicuous by its absence. It suffers from lack of teachers, lack of funds, lack of space and lack of supplies. There is only one full-time civilian teacher at Old Max for a population of 800-900 prisoners. The other teacher who is assigned to the school spends little or no time teaching prisoners. The education department has a budget of $6,000, half of which has been diverted to other departments. In early 1979, the school did not have basic supplies such as pencils, paper, chalk and textbooks.

Hardly any inmates are given the opportunity to participate in educational programs. All prisoners in cellhouses 3 and 4, and all inmates in punitive segregation, administrative segregation and protective custody are totally excluded from educational programs. Prisoners with jobs are not permitted to participate in daytime educational programs.

Even prisoners' efforts for self-improvement have been severely limited and inhibited. There are no areas for study, either in the classroom area or elsewhere within the maximum security prison; most study must take place in inmate cells under the most adverse circumstances without adequate lighting, space or quiet for reading. The prison does not provide prisoners with funds for correspondence courses. At the time this suit was commenced, there was no general library at Old Max. One is presently planned but existing books are stored in a basement. Programs to encourage use of library books are nonexistent. Even though the Colorado State Librarian has a duty to provide general library services to prisoners at Old Max, there was no provision for a professional librarian or library services. C.R.S., § 24-90-107 (a) (1973). No volunteers are used anywhere in the institution.

RECREATION

Recreation programs are important because they allow prisoners to release stress and avoid deterioration. Old Max does not have a sufficient number of recreational programs and opportunities for prisoners. Recreation programs principally consist of offender initiated athletic activities which are monitored by the recreation staff. They are clique oriented and serve to restrict the use of the gym and athletic equipment to a limited number of offenders. Non-athletic programs are almost non-existent. Access to the gym is limited. It is closed every day from 1 - 3 p.m. and entirely closed on Friday, Saturday and Sunday evenings.

Officials offer little in the way of programmed activities to combat boredom and idleness. The few group activities which are offered are restricted in number to 15 prisoners. In 1976, groups and community programs were open and memberships usually included from 60-100 prisoners. The only

group activities offered consist of a bi-monthly discussion group for 15 prisoners every other Monday night, an Alcoholics Anonymous group for 15 prisoners on Wednesday and Friday nights, and a Narcanon group for narcotics addicts on Thursday nights. Chicano and black study classes have been discontinued, as well as the bridge and chess clubs.

PERSONAL SAFETY

In recent years, Old Max has been plagued with violence and the fear of violence. In May 1975, there was a major riot at the maximum security prison. In August 1976, in response to the loss of lives, serious injuries, strongarming, violence and drug dealing, the Chief of the Division of Correctional Services and the Superintendent of Old Max ordered a massive lockdown of the entire prison population.

In September 1976, Governor Lamm declared that "the prison has fallen under a reign of terror," and called a special legislative session to address the situation. The legislature responded with bills making it a felony to make, possess, or bring contraband into the prison, making it a felony to assault a prison employee; increasing the penalties for escape; redefining riot offenses to include inciting, participating in, or failing to disperse from a riot; and requiring all visitors to submit to body and car searches.

The situation has not changed. In submitting the State Master Plan to Governor Lamm, Thomas Sheehan highlighted the dangerous atmosphere at Old Max stating: "[A]n environment of tension, anxiety and fear exists for both inmates and correctional staff. The result is an unsafe environment for both. Consequently, effective offender programming, including work activities, cannot occur." Recent studies have confirmed that the system is still fraught with tension and violence. In its investigation of cellhouse 3, the 1978 Interagency Crisis Committee found that:

> In the assessment of the staffing patterns of Cell House #3, it became overwhelmingly evident to the committee that staffing was grossly inadequate. The physical facility has ten individual units that should require a minimum of one person on duty per shift to maintain

observation and guarantee security. In addition, there should be three individuals unassigned that coordinate communication and programming in order to handle emergency situations and anything out of the ordinary. The present staffing finds 91 inmates in ten locations managed by three employees. There is no possible way that they can maintain security.

Courts have taken judicial notice that most acts of violence go unreported in prison. *See, e.g., Pugh v. Locke*, 406 F. Supp. 318, 325 (M.D. Ala. 1976). In general, the crime of rape at Old Max is unreported and prisoners report even fewer rapes than victims in the larger society. Even so, defendants' logs indicate an extraordinarily high amount of stabbings, assaults, fights and threats. Medical reports reflect an inordinately high number of suicide and self-mutilatory gestures. Contraband logs and shift reports reveal the excessive number of weapons which officials have uncovered.

The figures reflected in defendants' records represent the tip of the iceberg. Until recently, defendants did not keep records of the number of suicides or suicide attempts at the prison. Moreover, when this law suit began, defendants claimed that there were no readily available means of obtaining data on deaths or violent assaults. *See, e.g.*, Objections to Interrogatories 18-22 (October 2, 1978). Records which reflect violence are kept in different offices. To complicate matters, record-keeping practices have changed with each turnover in administration.

Perhaps one of the most accurate barometers of the fear that pervades Old Max is the extraordinary number of prisoners who have placed themselves in "protective custody" where they are deprived of almost all activities and are locked in tiny, cramped cells for all but a few hours a day. In July 1978, 18% of the prisoners at Old Max (135 of 765) were classified as protective custody. While the number of those in protective custody has been reduced to about 100, the number of inmates requesting protection has continued to increase.

The Attorney General's report on the events and causes of the May 18, 1975 riot identified faulty architecture, inade-

quate staffing, idleness, lack of constructive activity, inadequate guard training, racial tension, and poor contraband control as some of the underlying causes of violence. No significant improvements have been made.

As has been detailed, the architecture and layout of the facility make it virtually impossible to provide security. There are innumerable blind spots which permit assaults, stabbings and rapes to occur without surveillance. The design and staffing of all the major housing units contribute immeasurably to violence between inmates, often leading to severe injury and death. Prisoners have been brutally injured in every major living unit, including the "protective custody" units. What nooks, crannies and cells are not concealed are cluttered.

Defendants have failed to maintain adequate staffing at Old Max to protect prisoners from the unsafe physical surroundings. (1977 Master Plan, p. 7.2; Ex. 2) When one considers that the prisoner population at Old Max is greater today than it was in 1975 and that staffing patterns in the housing units have not been significantly increased, it is clear that the understaffing at Old Max is even more dangerous to prisoners today than it was in 1975. In its report to Governor Lamm and Superintendent Wilson on the rash of suicides and suicide attempts, the Interagency Crisis Committee concluded that "almost everything they reviewed sooner or later related to inadequate staffing." After reviewing staffing levels, the committee found that "it became overwhelmingly evident that staffing was grossly inadequate." Although these reports recommended substantial increases in staffing, the Department of Corrections requested fewer new positions than it needed and in fact decreased security staff at the facility in fiscal year 1978-79.

Administrative turnover has contributed to the unstable environment for corrections and the high tension among staff and prisoners (1977 Master Plan, p. 3.19; Ex. 2) In the past seven years, there have been six different Wardens at the Penitentiary, four Directors of the Division of Corrections, and four Executive Directors of the Department. As a result, policies and practices are constantly changing, leaving prisoners and staff in a constant state of flux.

An atmosphere of tension, anxiety and fear exists for both inmates and correctional staff. Reports dating to the Civil Rights Commission Study in 1973 have stressed the need for affirmative action to help lessen the disparity in race and culture between prisoners and guards. Although there have been some improvements, evidence reveals that only 4.4% of the correctional employees in the three Canon City prisons are black and only 6.5% are Hispanic.[10] Numerous reports have criticized the rural location of the prison which makes it particularly difficult to recruit professional staff and minorities. Given the cultural differences, the need for staff training is accentuated. Yet staff personnel receive no continuing training. Initial training was only recently instituted and, while it is laudable, it is grossly inadequate. No staff training meets any known professional or occupational standards.

MEDICAL CARE

Defendants have been aware of grave and systemic deficiencies in the medical care delivery system at Old Max for years. In 1974, the state grand jury which investigated the maximum security prison found that staffing was inadequate in medical and psychological services. At that time the grand jury cautioned "this situation can no longer be ignored by the Colorado State Government." In 1977, the State Master Plan found that staffing, facilities and equipment in medical and mental health services were still inadequate to meet prisoners' health care needs. The prison is totally ill-equipped and unable to provide essential health services. Both in terms of physical and mental health delivery, the conditions in the penitentiary amount to an emergency situation. As one expert described the situation, it is a time bomb ready to explode into a disaster.

The infirmary at Old Max is responsible for providing medical services to all prisoners in the Canon City area including prisoners at Old Max, the medium security prison, the women's prison and the diagnostic center. Staffing is completely inadequate. The shortage in medical staff includ-

---

[10] 30.37% Of the prisoners are Hispanic and 27.50% are black.

ing doctors, nurses, and other support staff results in inadequate medical coverage. The primary care physician who has responsibility for the entire medical care program is paid for ¾ time for prison services, he operates his own private practice and spends about three to five hours on-site at the prison per week on patient care. He is available for telephone consultation with staff as his personal circumstances permit. Physician assistants are acting as physician substitutes rather than as physician extenders. One physician assistant has requested more physician supervision, but his request has gone unheeded. There are no registered nurses to staff the infirmary at night. There is no ancillary staff to provide 24-hour a day, 7-day a week service. Because the medical facility is understaffed, medical personnel are continually called upon to perform services for which they have not been trained and for which they are not qualified.

Contrary to every medical expert opinion, the Department uses inmate help in the medical services area. In 1977 when the law suit was filed, prisoners worked as nurses and were the sole providers of health care when civilian nurses and doctors were not present. Prisoners continue to work in such sensitive areas as the x-ray lab, the medical records department, dental services, the optometry department, physical therapy department, and the mental health department. The use of inmates in these areas violates the American Medical Association Standards for Correctional Health Care, and Colorado's own health care standards. The use of such inmates presents serious problems in that some inmates may abuse their positions for personal gain or be subject to pressure from other inmates for special favors.

A prison infirmary requires quick exits and easy access to an outside medical facility. Adequate transportation is necessary to enable inmates to have outside medical consultations with specialists. One of the most serious problems with the prison health care system is that the Department of Corrections does not provide numerous vital medical procedures on site and relies on transporting prisoners to Colorado State Hospital for treatment. There has been a serious breakdown in this system because security staff control and interfere with prisoner access to needed health care services. Over the years, reports have pointed to an ongoing conflict of

interest and lack of cooperation between security and medical services. Medical decisions are not followed by security officers. Treatment is delayed and avoided. Illness or injury which could be treated successfully is neglected until near fatal conditions develop. One inmate, in otherwise excellent condition, suffered an appendicitis. After misdiagnosis and hours of delay before receiving competent attention, he was then delayed without any excuse at all, from being transported to the Colorado State Hospital. Transport was further interrupted and, upon arrival, adequate attention was not given until after the appendix ruptured and the inmate was placed in a life-threatening situation. The inmate was then transferred back to Old Max before he had adequately recovered and complications and further needless suffering ensued. Follow-up care was delayed and incompetent. Were it not for the fact that the inmate was previously in superb condition because of his training as a champion weightlifter, he might have died. It is certain that his suffering was needlessly prolonged and that the treatment he received was inexcuseably delayed and inadequate.

Another inmate, through bureaucratic indifference, was forced to engage in activities expressly prohibited by a physician. Though suffering from exceedingly painful spinal disc problems and consequent surgery, he was forced to engage in lifting and other heavy manual labor. Medical aid was denied and medical prescriptions ignored. The extent of his permanent injuries resulting from this treatment remains to be determined.

Another inmate came to the institution with a serious heart condition. Instead of being placed in the infirmary for direct observation and monitoring of his condition, he was placed in one of the cellhouses. He died before receiving medical attention.

Trips to Colorado State Hospital are dependent on the availability of transportation which is controlled by security staff. There is only one motor vehicle available for transferring prisoners to CSH. Medical staff must compete with security staff. As a result, there is a serious backlog of prisoners waiting for general surgery, orthopedic surgery and for treatment by ear, nose and throat specialists. Three to

four specialty clinics a week have been cancelled because Department of Corrections security staff did not provide the necessary transportation to CSH. Moreover, arbitrary rules imposed by prison officials have prevented prisoners from obtaining prompt medical treatment. Even though five prisoners may be scheduled to go to CSH for treatment, if one of those five prisoners is classified as "maximum security," security staff will only permit one prisoner to be transported to CSH that day. As of February 1978 there was a backlog of 212 prisoners waiting for treatment at CSH specialty clinics.[11]

Inmates are entitled to reasonable dental care. Serious dental problems constitute the single most prevalent physical health problem in the institution. Dental problems cause and complicate other physical and psychological ailments. Dental staff and equipment have been insufficient to provide urgent care, though some improvements have been made in recent months. The present inmate per dentist ratio is disproportionate in comparison with other prison systems and precludes proper treatment of dental needs. There is a serious backlog of prisoners awaiting oral surgery and other dental treatment. As of June 1, 1979, neither Colorado State Hospital nor the Department of Corrections had an oral surgeon. In some cases, acute infectious dental conditions have been left untreated or have not been treated in a timely or appropriate fashion. Dental health care at Old Max is well below minimally acceptable standards for dental care, including the June 1, 1978, Draft Federal Standards for Medical Care and Health Services in Corrections, the American Medical Association Standards on Medical and Health Services in Corrections, and the Colorado Dental Association Standards.

---

[11] The backlog problem has been complicated by surgical residents at CSH who pick and choose among procedures and will only do ones that interest them. Their treatment of prisoners is rude and unsympathetic. Uninteresting cases go untreated. One side effect of this is that people waiting for surgical procedures are on pain killers and are becoming addicted. Another is quite understandable hostility which predictably will erupt on some unknowing innocent person at a later time following release. The subsequent crime and victim will be included in the inevitable statistics used to describe recidivism.

"Mental health needs are shunned and ignored as if they were an ugly stepchild of corrections." Plaintiffs' Trial Brief, at 43. A few years ago, the psychology department was abolished. Staff were reclassified as "corrections specialists" and moved over to the medical department. The Administrator of the Medical Department, however, claims "mental health" is not his responsibility. Presently, psychological services are under the Programs Manager and have been renamed the "mental health" department. The prison does not have adequate staff trained in psychology or psychiatry. The entire operating budget for the mental health department for 1978-1979 is less than $500.

In 1978, the Department reported more than 70 incidents of suicide and self-mutilation attempts. Between January 1, 1979 and May 30, 1979, the Department reported more than 21 incidents. The Department's own Five Year Plan issued in February 1978 recognized that "many, if not all of these incidents [involving self-inflicted wounds] could [have been] avoided by placing these inmates in a professionally-administered unit that does not entail the almost total sensory deprivation of cellhouse 3."

The Canon Correctional Facility complex has been without psychiatric coverage for years. A psychiatrist from the Reformatory in Buena Vista comes to Old Max once a month or sometimes once every two months. This "coverage" is inadequate to meet minimally acceptable standards for psychiatric care. The prison has been without a Ph.D. trained psychologist since the fall of 1978. Counseling personnel who are an important adjunct to psychological and psychiatric staff are deficient both in numbers and in qualifications. Until the middle of 1979 there were only two full-time equivalent counseling positions in the mental health department. An additional position was added during the summer, but none of these individuals are licensed as clinicians in the State of Colorado. The department has no civilian support staff. As a result, the counselors on staff spend a disproportionate amount of time on administrative and clerical work rather than treatment. The mental health department is not even considered a part of the medical department by the institution. It is under the jurisdiction of the Programs Manager.

Staffing deficiencies in the mental health department have been brought to the attention of the Department for years and have been disregarded. In February 1977, the University of Colorado Department of Preventive Medicine and Health Services conducted an on-site evaluation of health services and found critical shortages in mental health department staffing. The evaluation recommended significant staffing increases. To date, these recommendations have not been implemented.

In 1978, the mental health department at Old Max requested an additional psychologist to work with severely disturbed prisoners in cellhouse 3. The legislature approved the position, but the Department of Corrections used the money to hire a personnel officer instead.

In May 1978, Steve Bloom, the former Department Director of Psychology and Diagnostic Services made a "conservative" estimate of current mental health needs of prisoners at Colorado State Penitentiary and found that there was a need for at least 12 full-time mental health clinicians who could devote 75% of their time to treatment activities as opposed to administrative training or supervisory functions. His recommendations have not been heeded.

At best, the Department's limited mental health staff operates on a crisis intervention basis with little or no opportunity for either adequate planning or implementation of treatment programs. The mental health staff have an excessive caseload. They do not receive consistent information from the Diagnostic Unit identifying prisoners in need of psychological treatment. Even if recommended, the staff is inadequate to provide treatment to those in need. Individual and group counseling are severely restricted. Psychiatric treatment is practically nonexistent. There is a large waiting list of prisoners in need of treatment. The monitoring of the effects of psychotropic medication on individual inmates is lamentably inadequate.

The physical facilities in which mentally disturbed prisoners are housed are as inadequate as the staff available to treat them. Acutely psychotic patients, suicidal patients,

patients on psychotropic medication and mentally retarded prisoners are housed in the most restrictive cellhouse at Old Max (cellhouse 3) along with prisoners in administrative and punitive segregation who are being punished for disciplinary violations. Cellhouse 3 has no resemblance to a treatment ward; it is a segregation unit with small cells that are filthy, inadequately lighted, improperly ventilated and infested with vermin and rodents. Prisoners are locked in their cells over 22 hours a day. No treatment or activities are provided. Prisoners are never allowed out of their cells except for a brief time every other day for showers or yard time. Such restrictive confinement causes irreparable disabilities.

The Department's own Five Year Plan issued in February 1978 recognized that many of the present cellhouse 3 population do not require the maximum security, highly restrictive regimen typical of cellhouse 3. These individuals require a professional staff experienced in social and psychological needs of disturbed patients. Frequently, because of the low level of individual attention devoted to mentally ill prisoners and because of the high level of sensory deprivation that results from housing individuals in a total isolation environment, prisoners at Old Max are compelled to make suicidal or self-mutilatory gestures in order to attract help. Yet bed space in the infirmary is under utilized because of a lack of staff.

In the summer of 1978, there was a rash of suicides and suicidal attempts by prisoners housed in cellhouse 3. Between April 25 and June 18, 1978 alone, four prisoners in cellhouse 3 succeeded in killing themselves. After these fatalities, the Department set up a special inter-agency crisis committee to address the suicide situation in cellhouse 3. The committee made numerous recommendations which have been ignored.

The Interagency Crisis Committee found that staffing was totally inadequate to ensure the life and safety of prisoners in cellhouse 3. Moreover, the committee found that the mixture of prisoners in cellhouse 3 is "basically detrimental." The committee reported that:

> The sociopath is found to take brutal advantage of those he can intimidate who have inadequate personalities, low ego images or standard social ethics. There needs to be further separation in relationship to security.

The committee's findings brought the reality of the situation in cellhouse 3 to the attention of defendants Ault and Wilson, yet the situation in cellhouse 3 is a dangerous today as it was a year and a half ago. One resident of cellhouse 3 has never been convicted of a crime. He was deposited there by the State Hospital because he is dangerous. He is also insane and in desperate need of treatment.

In June 1978, the Special Interagency Crisis Committee recommended that the Department seek funding in fiscal 1978-79 for:

> —a ward in the infirmary for acute mental health problems.
>
> —one or more treatment units within the Department for long-term psychotics and inadequate offenders and staff it accordingly.
>
> —increased staffing in Cell House 3 to provide at least 1 staff per tier during the day and evening shifts, 3 F.T.E. program/counseling staff per shift, and 1 psychiatric technician per shift.

The Department of Corrections never attempted to implement these recommendations.

Although the Colorado State Hospital has a forensic unit, mental health staff at Old Max have had great difficulty finding bed space for prisoners at Old Max with acute psychiatric problems. CSH makes only five beds available for prisoners to participate in long-term treatment programs. As a result, prisoners with acute mental problems have had to wait as long as 1½ months for space to become available. Even when prisoners are transferred to CSH, they are only there a short time before being returned to the same intolerable conditions at the prison without sufficient follow-up care.

CSH transfers nonconvicted state hospital patients to Old Max. These patients are housed in cellhouse 3 along with the most dangerous and severely disturbed prisoners in the system and have virtually no access to psychiatric care. In 1973 and 1974 the United States Civil Rights Commission and the Colorado State Grand Jury found that there was a serious problem with housing CSH patients at Old Max because of the lack of opportunity to provide consistent medical and psychiatric assistance to such patients. Despite their findings, this situation has not changed.

The number of drug and alcohol treatment programs available is insufficient to meet the need for the number of prisoners who enter Old Max with drug and alcohol problems and medical needs. The Department has been aware of the enormity and severity of this problem for years. In 1974 and 1975, studies revealed that 68% of prisoners at Colorado State Penitentiary had drug and alcohol problems. Recent data from the Diagnostic Center reveal that 99% of incoming prisoners tested for substance abuse had significant involvement with alcohol and drugs. The Colorado state legislature has expressly stated that "alcoholism and intoxication are matters of statewide concern" and that "the social and economic costs and the waste of human resources caused by alcohol abuse and alcoholism are massive, tragic and no longer acceptable." C.R.S., §25-1-301 (1) (2) (1973). The legislature expressly directed the Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse of the Department of Health to cooperate with the Department of Corrections in establishing and conducting programs for the prevention of alcoholism and treatment of alcoholics and intoxicated persons in appropriate agencies and institutions. C.R.S., §25-1-304 (1978). Nonetheless, the evidence reveals that Colorado prisoners are not even given adequate opportunity to correct drug and alcohol problems. The few programs which exist at Old Max involve only a smidgen of prisoners. Prisoner self-help programs have been disallowed or severely restricted in number by prison officials. Services by outside organizations have been discontinued.

The Department of Corrections has ignored the opportunity to transfer prisoners from Old Max to the Drug Treatment Center at Colorado State Hospital. In the past two years, the Department of Corrections has approved transfer

of only one prisoner from Old Max for this program. Even then it took the mental health administrator nine months to get the classification board to approve the transfer and several more months to effectuate it. Similarly, Federal agencies have approved grants to the Colorado Department of Corrections for drug and alcohol treatment only to have the State of Colorado refuse to appropriate the minimal necessary matching funds.

Defendants' disregard of the need of prisoners for drug and alcohol treatment contributes to the totality of conditions which make degeneration probable and self-improvement unlikely. In fact, two thirds of Colorado inmates paroled in recent years had drug or alcohol problems when they were released.

CLASSIFICATION

As Judge Johnson stated in *Pugh v. Locke*, 406 F. Supp. at 324, "the degree to which [the lack of a working classification system] impedes the attainment of any proper objectives of a penal system cannot be overstated." Colorado has recognized this importance by requiring by statute that the Department of Corrections maintain a diagnostic program which will provide that each prisoner be assigned

> to a correctional institution which has the type of security and, to the extent possible, appropriate programs of education, employment, and treatment available, which are designed to accomplish maximum rehabilitation . . . and to prepare an offender for placement into as productive an employment as possible following imprisonment. C.R.S., 17-40-102 (1978).

The classification system used in Colorado results in overclassification of prisoners both to and within the maximum security facility. In spite of the clear mandate of the Department of Corrections' policies that no prisoner should be housed in a more secure status than security risk and program needs dictate, at the present time, at least ⅔ of the prisoners housed at the maximum security facility do not require maximum security housing. According to Department data, on April 30, 1979, only 60 of the 586 prisoners

housed at the maximum security facility with a maximum security classification should have been so classified. The same data reveals that 137 prisoners at Old Max should have been classified for minimum security.

Because of a continuing lack of bedspace, even those prisoners appropriately classified as less than maximum security are often either housed for lengthy periods of time under maximum security conditions at the Diagnostic Unit or are sent "behind the walls" of Old Max. A number of those who should have been sent to the medium security institution have been sent to Old Max. In addition, over 60 young men who should have been sent to the Reformatory also were sent to Old Max.

In fiscal 1977-78, the Department of Corrections received a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for a casework development reporting system which allowed for computerized scoring and analysis of diagnostic tests. During that same year, the legislature by statute required that a "Colorado Diagnostic Program" be centralized at the Diagnostic Unit adjacent to the old maximum security facility at Canon City. C.R.S., §16-11-308 (1979), 17-40-102 (1978). The Department contracted with Herbert Eber and Psychological Resources, Inc., of Atlanta, Georgia, to develop a computerized classification program (Psychodiagnostic and Risk Assessment System) and an information storage and retrieval system (VISOR). In March 1978, for the first time in Colorado history, the Department promulgated a set of departmental criteria for classifaction. In spite of the expenditure of federal funds and the availability of fairly impressive computer capabilities, the effects of this recent movement have not corrected the many long existing classification problems.

A person's first housing after being sentenced to prison is in one of 118 cells in the Diagnostic Unit at Canon City. Although the diagnostic process is supposed to take nine days to complete, incoming prisoners stay at the Diagnostic Unit an average of four to five weeks with some staying as long as three months. During that time, the prisoners generally stay locked in their small inadequately lit and window-

less cells in the three-tiered cellblock. They are allowed out of their cells for meals, a maximum of one hour of exercise per day, and shower and formal diagnostic requirements. Visitation and canteen services to prisoners in the unit were banned in 1978. In the past six months these have been restored to a limited extent. Prisoners are not allowed to visit the law library. They are allotted a total of two stamps for two weeks to correspond. The one television set that was at one time available has been removed. The only reason asserted for the existence of these conditions is a lack of staff.

During the time the prisoner is at the Diagnostic Unit, he is given a battery of tests, including three personality inventory tests. The test results are computerized and serve as the core of the automated system for classification. The results are derived by the use of equations devised by Dr. Eber which give various weights to certain answers given to certain questions on two of the personality inventory tests. A narrative print-out statement of the results is produced which purports to predict for classification use the future behavior of the prisoner including violence, escapes, management problems and recidivism. The predictions become a part of the prisoner's permanent file and are available not only to the "programmers" at the Diagnostic Unit (none of whom are licensed clinical psychologists or have adequate training in psychometrics) but also to case managers and other nonprofessional staff. They are also furnished to the parole board. It is unclear to what extent these predictions are used to make security designations within correctional facilities (maximum, close, medium, minimum A and B) or to determine facility placement since any and all professional judgment, diagnosis and predictions are subject to absolute veto or modification by security officers.

Dr. Eber's equations are based upon testing done on prisoners and nonprisoners in Georgia and Alabama. No revalidation studies have been done on those equations; and there has been no revalidation or restandardization of the equations utilized in making predictive judgments of the future behavior of Colorado inmates. Dr. Eber admits that the predictions made are so poor that they should be used for classification only as initial classification by trained and

experienced staff when there is no other good evidence available, and future classification instead based on actual behavior prior to and during the first several months of incarceration. Such predictions should only be used, if at all, by trained clinical psychologists for mental health diagnosis and/or care. They certainly should not be sent to the parole board.

Unfortunately, the predictions are not utilized by trained personnel for legitimate purposes. The criteria listed in the Policy Statement are vague and lack definition. For example, one must be classified maximum if the escape risk potential is "high" or the inmate has "serious adjustment" problems whereas one should be in close custody if the escape risk is "moderate" and there are "adjustment" problems.[12] (DOC Reg. 202-1) Further, there are serious overclassifications caused by the arbitrarily chosen categorization of people who should be classified "maximum security." For example, neither a need for protection nor a likelihood for self-harm is a rational basis for a blanket requirement of maximum security treatment. Rather, all data concerning each inmate should be viewed in its entirety and considered on an individual basis by trained staff with adequate behavioral information.

Irrational use of bars are even more serious problems for the programmers at Diagnostic Unit in making facility assignments. Under present policy, for example, *all* persons with more than six years remaining for parole eligibility and *all* persons with a class I misconduct report (any assault or "deviate" sexual misconduct) within the past year are to be assigned to the maximum security facility. (DOC Reg. 202-1) (Code for Penal Discipline) Obviously, such factors should be taken into account along with other factors in a rational classification scheme. They should not be prohibitions which render all other data meaningless.

Programmers at the Diagnostic Unit also suffer from a lack of information. In thirty per cent of the cases, they do

---

[12] One can be classified medium security if there are "minor adjustment" problems.

not receive statutorily required presentencing reports from local officials. They are significantly understaffed and cannot spend adequate time interviewing inmates. Because of staff shortages and overwork, they have been forced to discontinue the past practice of contacting people in the community to gain background information. Finally, in spite of the dictates of the Department's own 1977 Master Plan, initial classification decisions are made by only one programmer and not by an institutional team. There is no system for monitoring decisions of the five programmers to assure that similar criteria are being applied in making classifications. (1977 Corrections Master Plan, 5.25).

With all the crippling deficiencies in the classification process at the Diagnostic Unit, the process breaks down further when the prisoner is sent to the maximum security facility with his security designation and a statement of his "general needs" that may have been identified.[13] The program staff at the Diagnostic Unit has no further participation in individual inmate program decisions. Further, the diagnostic packet which is prepared at the Diagnostic Unit is usually ignored at the maximum security facility. Many decisionmakers are not provided relevant information from the packet. The Department has made no follow-up studies to determine the correlation between diagnostic recommendations and actual placement. The lack of coordination of the Diagnostic Unit with other components of the Department which was noted in the 1977 Master Plan still exists. (Master Plan p. 5.15) The plan stated that in order to carry out effective classification decisions, the classification committee for each institution should be composed of three people, the institution's program manager, a representative of the security staff and of the professionally trained personnel who perform counseling and casework activity. (Master Plan p. 5.24) The dire results that can occur when one person dominates a fragmented and unverified classification system is amply illustrated by the fact that the Chief Classifica-

---

[13] The best trained classification personnel are at the Diagnostic Unit. Their past practice of structuring specific programs for prisoners was discontinued because the facilities were unable to meet the program demands. Now facility personnel do specific need classification based upon space available.

tion Officer at the maximum security prison until November 20, 1978, made, in the words of Dr. Eber, "grossly inappropriate classifications," often with absolutely no factual support for his decisions.[14]

The Master Plan and recommended classification practices have yet to be implemented. Job, program and housing decisions are relegated to separate and diverse components of the prison system and not to centralized and appropriately staffed classification teams. Mark McKinna, a former guard with a social services degree, is the chairman of the Classification Board which determines security classification, meritorious good time, and assignment to Cellhouses 4 and 5. The other two members of the board are selected by McKinna based upon who is available at the time. No effort has been made to bring about maximum staff participation in the process. Major Johnson, the Security Manager, and Captain Gindro, the Intelligence Officer, are often the other two members, particularly when decisions relating to security classification are to be made. A correlation between the composition of the board and the continuing and admitted overclassification at the maximum security facility is apparent.

Curiously, housing assignments within the facility and job assignments are not under the control of McKinna or the Classification Board. Instead, Major Matthews makes housing assignment. The various job supervisors, with total discretion and no departmental criteria, hire prisoners for the few jobs that are available. Inmates are hired on a referral basis from other inmates. No coordinated effort is made to use job assignments as a rehabilitative tool. There is no system in effect to assure equitable distribution of available jobs. Disparate hiring on a racial and ethnic basis is obvious and statistically demonstrable.

The classification process is completely ineffectual. There aren't enough case manages. The few who are employed lack professional training in counseling and other

---

[14] Some of those persons who were "grossly inappropriately classified" have still not had their classification adjusted and the inappropriate classification designations are still in the prisoner files.

casework activities. Case managers do not have regular and frequent communication with prisoners and do not aid them in obtaining appropriate jobs, housing and program assignments. Case managers have no clout and no means of enforcing their decisions.

No caseworker position existed until December 1978, at which time, five guards with no special education or training were selected to be case managers. Even if they were adequately educated and trained, they would be unable to handle their expected case loads of 185 or more prisoners. They have no support staff and spend an inordinate amount of time doing clerical work. They share inadequate office space with no space for private interviews or counseling. The present case managers do not sit on classification boards; they have no participation in classification decisions, seldom see their clients and cannot hope to comply with requirements for regular program reviews. Some prisoners are not even aware of their case manager's existence.

ACCESS

Access to human contact is an essential human need. Within the prison setting, questions concerning access generally involve visitation, correspondence and assertion of justiciable rights.

a. Visitation

Visitation with family and friends involves fundamental rights of association, privacy, and liberty which are protected by the First, Ninth and Fourteenth Amend-

ments to the Constitution of the United States, [15] yet Section One of the prison regulations until recently gave prison staff complete discretion to revoke or suspend temporarily all visiting privileges. Such regulations are contrary to modern correctional standards which require the superintendent to present clear and convincing evidence that visitation jeopardizes the safety and security of the institution or the visitors before he or his designee can suspend visitation rights. *See* A.C.A. Standard §4351. A new regulation on visiting was adopted in June 1979. *See* CCF REGULATION 301-19. Some criteria and procedures have been developed. There is no indication that the inmate or visitor has any input to the decision or access to any grievance procedure.

Defendants have denied prisoners at Old Max the opportunity for contact visitation. In August 1976, prison officials converted the visiting room at Old Max from contact to non-contact visiting by constructing concrete walls and plastic barriers to separate prisoners from visitors so no touching was possible. No provision was made for contact visitation for those prisoners whose classification and behavior merited open visiting privileges. The regulations adopted in June 1979 restore some contact visiting. A few plastic barriers have been removed, but contact is still very limited.

---

[15] Virtually every statement on visitation from the American Correctional Association Manual to the State Association of Correctional Administrators (1972), every national study (e.g., the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards & Goals) and every major textbook on corrections stresses the critical nature of visitation both in terms of the reduction of tension inside the prison and the facilitation of the ultimate rehabilitation of the prisoner by strengthening his ties with the "free world." *See* A.B.A., "Tentative Draft of Standards Relating to the Legal Status of Prisoners," 14 *Am. Crim. L. Rev.* 502 (Winter 1977); *See also ACA, Manual of Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions* §§4210, 4305, 4351 (1977)

Even defendants' Five Year Plan recognizes that the mental agony of family separation is a strong negative factor in the inmate's life and often affects the inmate's participation in otherwise beneficial programs and maintenance of interpersonal relations with staff and other inmates. The inability to communicate privately with a spouse or family member makes the inmate susceptible to decay of family relations.

Every expert witness in this case, including defendants', has testified to the importance of contact visiting and the debilitating effects caused by the denial of contact visitation. The defendants' 1977 Master Plan recognizes that the denial of contact visits has caused increased tension in the prisoner population. Reasonable limits on visitation, adapted to individual circumstances, and decisions to deny open visitation are not based on reliable facts which indicate that an individual prisoner presents an actual threat, e.g., a clear and present danger, to the security of the institution.

Defendants' visitation policies deny prisoners the opportunity to visit with non-relatives; Colorado only permits a prisoner to visit with friends if the prisoner has no relatives in the state and then allows the prisoner to have only three visitors on an approved list.[16] Moreover, defendants' visiting policies and procedures limit the days on which prisoners may visit. Prisoners in different classifications are allowed visits only on particular days of the week. There are a number of days when visits are not allowed at all.

b. Correspondence

Regulations at Old Max permit prison staff to read and inspect all incoming and outgoing general mail and to censor or exclude mail according to certain criteria. Books, newspapers and periodicals may be ordered and paid for by inmates or outside correspondents, but must come directly from the publisher or an established vendor or distributor. Outgoing legal mail can only be opened in "extreme emergency cases, and only when probable cause exists to believe contraband [or improper communications] exists. . . ." CCF REGULATION 302-18(6). Incoming legal mail is opened and inspected for contraband in the presence of the inmate.

One policy at the prison refuses to deliver mail in any language other than English, even though one-third of the prison population is Hispanic. Numerous prisoners lack

---

[16] A.B.A. Draft Standard §6.2(c) provides that prisoners should be able to receive any visitor not previously excluded for good cause.

speaking, reading and writing skills in English, as do many of their correspondents.[17]

Defendants also limit receipt of mail, when in the judgment of the mental health staff and the particular inmate's caseworker, certain correspondence "would cause severe emotional disturbance to the [receiving] inmate." CCF REGULATION 302-18(7)(b). The problem here is that there are no psychiatrists or even licensed clinicians on the Canon Correctional Facility staff, and the case management system is so inadequate as to be virtually non-existent.

c. Access to the Courts

The law libraries at Old Max fall below any known acceptable standard. The general population law library has approximately half of the law volumes recommended by the American Association of Law Libraries Committee on Law Library Services to Prisoners. The library consists mostly of outdated advance sheets, pocket parts and discards from various sources. The small libraries which have been provided for those in protective custody in cellhouse 7 and those in segregation in cellhouse 3 have fewer materials and are even more inadequate. There is no civilian staff with paralegal or legal training to supervise the libraries or assist inmates with research. A recent evaluation of the prison law libraries recommended that at least two full-time employees be hired to supervise the libraries on a day to day basis.

The general population law library is open five days a week from 9:00 to 11:30 a.m., 12:30 to 3:30 p.m., and, after the evening count, from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. Only three inmates are allowed in the library during any one of these periods. The smaller libraries in cellhouses 3 and 7 are open for two or three hours in the morning, and again for a similar number of hours in the afternoon. Only one inmate is allowed in each of these libraries at any one time. Sign-up lists for access to the libraries are on a first-come, first-served basis, but inmates with pending litigation have first priority.

---

[17] The Federal Bureau of Prisons recently deleted from their proposed correspondence regulations the requirement that all inmates write their letters in English. 44 F.R. 35957 (June 19, 1979).

No law materials can be "checked out" or taken from the libraries, and photocopies cost fifteen cents a page. The limited number of typewriters are in various states of disrepair, and supplies of paper, carbon and other needed items are sporadic and often inadequate.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

There is no dispute that "the Constitution does not stop at the prison gate, but rather inures to the benefit of all, even to those citizens behind prison walls." *Battle v. Anderson*, 447 F. Supp. 516, 524 (E.D.Okla. 1977), *aff'd*, 564 F.2d 388 (10th Cir. 1977). *See Bell v. Wolfish*, ____ U.S. at ____, 99 S.Ct. at 1877, 60 L.Ed. 2d at 472; *Wolf v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539, 555-56 (1974); and *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. at 321. At the same time, " '[l]awful incarceration brings about the necessary withdrawal or limitation of many privileges and rights, a retraction justified by the considerations underlying our penal system.' " *Pell v. Procunier*, 417 U.S. 817, 822 (1974) (quoting *Price v. Johnston*, 334 U.S. 266, 285 (1948)).[18]

The primary source of plaintiffs' constitutional attacks on the conditions of confinement at the Canon Correctional Facility is the Eighth Amendment's prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment, applicable to Colorado and all other states by way of the Fourteenth Amendment. *See Robinson v. California*, 370 U.S. 660 (1962). The scope of the Eighth Amendment "proscribes more than physically barbarous punishments," and requires that a government "provide . . . care for those whom it is punishing by incarceration." *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 102-03 (1976). Challenges to conditions of prison confinement have been recognized as valid constitutional claims, as such conditions may constitute cruel and unusual punishment. *See, e.g., Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97; *Wilwording v. Swenson*, 404 U.S. 249; *Battle v. Anderson*, 376 F. Supp. 402 (E.D. Okla. 1974), subsequent opinion, 447 F. Supp. 516 (E.D. Okla. 1977), *aff'd*, 564 F.2d 388 (10th Cir. 1977); *Holt v. Hutto*, 363 F. Supp. 194 (E.D. Ark. 1973), *aff'd in relevant part, rev'd in part and remanded sub nom. Finney v. Arkansas Board of Corrections*, 505 F.2d

---

[18] The Supreme Court recognized four functions of a corrections system in *Pell v. Procunier*, 417 U.S. 817, 822-23 (1974): deterrence, confinement of criminal offenders, rehabilitation, and internal security.

194 (8th Cir. 1974), *on remand*, *Finney v. Hutto*, 410 F. Supp. 251 (E.D. Ark. 1976), *aff'd*, 548 F.2d 740 (8th Cir. 1977), *aff'd*, 437 U.S. 678 (1978); *Newman v. Alabama*, 349 F. Supp. 278 (M.D. Ala. 1972), *aff'd in relevant part*, 503 F.2d 1320 (5th Cir. 1974), *cert. denied*, 421 U.S. 948 (1974).[19]

In *Clappier v. Flynn*, 605 F.2d 519, 533-34 (10th Cir. 1979), the Tenth Circuit recently addressed the issues of liability under Section 1983 for omissions or failures to act, which characterize many, if not most, of the problems which plaintiffs have suffered at the Canon Correctional Facility.

> [T]he area of concern in terms of a Sec. 1983 liability involving an allegation of cruel and unusual punishment *relating to a claimed ommission* requires proof of exceptional circumstances and conduct so grossly incompetent, inadequate or excessive as to shock the conscience or to be intolerable to basic fairness. Such, in our view, is consistent with those opinions interpreting the term 'cruel and unusual punishment' forbidden by the United States Constitution as meaning something inhuman, barbarous, violative of basic concepts of de-

---

[19] Defendants at several points of this litigation have argued that *Bell v. Wolfish*, U.S., 99 S.Ct. 1861, 60 L.Ed. 2d 447 (1979), requires that a condition or practice first be found to constitute "punishment" before it can then be determined whether it is "cruel and unusual." The issue was central in *Bell v. Wolfish* because most of the persons confined at the Metropolitan Correctional Center were federal pretrial detainees who had been charged with crimes but not yet convicted. While the parties conceded that such persons can be legitimately confined by a government prior to a determination of their guilt or innocence, *id.*, 99 S. Ct. at 1865, 60 L.Ed.2d at 458, these persons could not be subjected to punishment. The question, then, as framed by Justice Rehnquist for the majority, was whether conditions at the MCC "amount[ed] to punishment of the detainee" in violation of Fifth Amendment due process. *Id.*, 99 S.Ct. at 1872, 60 L.Ed.2d at 466. For a convicted inmate, on the other hand, confinement in a penal institution *is* punishment, and it is the execution of that confinement which is subject to the Eighth Amendment's prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment. The Supreme Court has recognized that inadequate attention to prisoners' medical needs may constitute cruel and unusual punishment, even though I assume, with some misgivings, that medical care is not intended as punishment. *See Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976).

> cency and so foul as to shock the court's sensibilities. *Trop v. Dulles*, 356 U.S. 86, 78 S.Ct. 590, 2 L.Ed.2d 630 (1958); *Weems v. United States*, 217 U.S. 349, 30 S.Ct. 544, 54 L.Ed. 793 (1910);. . .
>
> In *Battle v. Anderson*, 376 F. Supp. 402 (E.D.Okla. 1974); *aff'd*,. . . , the District Court stated that while the Eighth Amendment does not have fixed, settled and definite limits, still 'cruel and unusual punishment' exists if prisoners are maintained in a manner fairly characterized as foul, inhuman and violative of basic concepts of human decency. [Emphasis in the original.]

Plaintiffs have shown that grossly inadequate conditions exist at the Canon Correctional Facility.[20]

---

[20] As the Court of Appeals recognized in *Clappier*, trial courts "[have been] provided scant guidance in this difficult area." *Clappier v. Flynn*, 605 F.2d 519, 533 (10th Cir. 1979). For a discussion of the various standards and approaches that lower courts have taken, *see* Robbins, *Federalism, State Prison Reform, and Evolving Standards of Human Decency: On Guessing, Stressing, and Redressing Constitutional Rights*, 26 Kan. L. Rev. 551 (1978). In *Baker v. McCollan*, ____ U.S. ____, 99 S.Ct. 2689, 2692, 61 L.Ed.2d 433, 439 (1979), the Supreme Court noted the difficulty of resolving the scope of liability under Section 1983:

> [T]he question whether an allegation of simple negligence is sufficient to state a cause of action under §1983 is more elusive than it appears at first blush. It may well not be susceptible of a uniform answer across the entire spectrum of conceivable constitutional violations which might be the subject of a §1983 action. In any event, before the relationship between the defendant's state of mind and his liability under §1983 can be meaningfully explored, it is necessary to isolate the precise constitutional violation with which he is charged.

The "precise constitutional violation" at issue here is whether conditions of confinement at the Canon Correctional Facility are cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the Eighth Amendment. While the Supreme Court, in according prison administrators deference, has used such language as "deliberate indifference," *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 104-05 (1976), and "exaggerated response," *Fell v. Procunier*, 417 U.S. 817, 827 (1974), I am in complete agreement with Justice Stevens' dissenting opinion in *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. at 263-68 (Stevens, J., dissenting), that, if such language "is meant to indicate that intent is a necessary part of an Eighth Amendment violation, I disagree. If a State elects to impose imprisonment as a punishment for crime, I believe it has an obligation to provide the persons in its custody with a health care system which meets minimal standards of decency." *Id.* at 267 n. 13. The question under the Eighth Amendment is whether a form

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

The Supreme Court has recognized a matrix for determining whether certain conditions of confinement are constitutionally unacceptable. *See Bell v. Wolfish*, 99 S. Ct. at 1875-76, 60 L.Ed.2d at 470-71; *Hutto v. Finney*, 437 U.S. at 685-87. On one side of the matrix are conditions of confinement; on the other are various durations of confinement. The shorter the duration of confinement, the more spartan are the allowable conditions. As the Court said in *Hutto v. Finney*, "the length of confinement cannot be ignored in deciding whether the confinement meets constitutional standards. A filthy, overcrowded cell and a diet of 'grue' might be tolerable for a few days and intolerably cruel for weeks or months." *Id.* at 686-87. At the Canon Correctional

---

(Footnote 20 continued)

punishment is cruel and unusual in its execution. When there has been a failure on the part of an institution as a whole to meet constitutional minima and that failure is shown by substantial evidence, there has been a violation of the Eighth Amendment. As Justice Stevens said in *Estelle*,

> Subjective motivation may well determine what, if any, remedy is appropriate against a particular defendant. However, whether the constitutional standard has been violated should turn on the character of the punishment rather than the motivation of the individual who inflicted it. Whether the conditions in Andersonville were the product of design, negligence, or mere poverty, they were cruel and inhuman.

Id. at 267-68 (footnote omitted). (Similar reasoning is implicit in the decisions of the trial court and court of appeals in *Battle v. Anderson*. The lower court said that neither good will nor lack of financing was a defense "to a failure to provide minimum constitutional standards," 447 F. Supp. at 526, and the court of appeals said that certain otherwise reasonable fears and "significant progress in correcting many of the abuses and/or providing for new or additional facilities" was likewise not an excuse for continuing constitutional violations. 564 F.2d at 403. Still, while my heart is with Justice Stevens, jurisprudence is with those decisions endorsed by a majority of the court. Even so, as set out in this opinion, I find that the conditions of confinement at the Canon Correctional Facility meet all tests by all known measures of proof. As shown by substantial evidence, these conditions shock the conscience, are incompatible with evolving standards of decency, involve unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain, and evidence both deliberate indifference to the prisoners' protected interests and "circumstances and conduct so grossly incompetent, inadequate or excessive as . . . to be intolerable to basic fairness." *Clappier v. Flynn*, 605 F.2d at 533.

Facility, inmates are placed in substandard living conditions for a variety of reasons — because they are "transitional workers," or in alleged need of protective custody, or simply because there is no room at lesser security prisons, none of which are justified as short-term disciplinary measures.[21] Those conditions are instead the day to day character of confinement at the Canon Correctional Facility.

In *Battle v. Anderson*, the Tenth Circuit affirmed an order which adopted the American Public Health Association standard of 60 square feet as the constitutional minimum for cells in which inmates of a general population are routinely confined. 564 F.2d at 395. Cells in cellhouses 1 and 7 are almost half this size, and grossly inadequate under any standard. Additionally, the 60 square foot standard is premised on the assumption that inmates are outside of their cells for a substantial part of the day, engaging in either vocational, educational or recreational activities. The evidence in this case shows, however, that a substantial number of prisoners at Old Max, particularly those in cellhouse 3, are locked in their cells from 20 to 23 hours a day. For persons confined for such long periods of time, the American Correction Association standards call for 80 square feet, and I find that to be the constitutional minimum for any prisoner confined in his cell for 20 or more hours a day.[22]

---

[21] In fact, each of these reasons is offered as an excuse for some of the major problems evidenced in this case: lack of jobs, inadequate security, and overcrowding of the state's correctional facilities.

[22] Even with regard to the lower requirement for inmates outside their cells for substantial periods of time, the trial courts in *Battle* recognized that a number of accepted and approved standards require significactly greater space than the 60 square feet which it adopted. *See* 447 F. Supp. at 525. In addition, I emphasize that these standards are not necessarily applicable to short-term disciplinary confinement. As I stated above, the conditions addressed here are the general character of confinement even for those who have not been charged with any misconduct.

The conditions at the Canon Correctional Facility stand in stark contrast to those at the Metropolitan Correctional Center which was the subject of the litigation leading up to *Bell v. Wolfish*, ____ U.S. ____, 99 S.Ct. 1861, 60 L.Ed.2d 447 (1979). In its decision the Supreme Court remarked:

In addition to physical space, courts have considered the totality of environmental health and safety conditions in determining whether that environment is constitutionally acceptable. *See, e.g., Williams v. Edwards*, 547 F.2d 1206 (5th Cir. 1977); *Palmigiano v. Garrahy*, 443 F. Supp. 956 (D.R.I. 1977), *appeal dismissed*, 599 F.2d 17 (1st Cir. 1979); *Pugh v. Locke*, 406 F. Supp. 318 (M.D. Ala. 1976), *aff'd and remanded sub nom., Newman v. Alabama*, 559 F.2d 283 (5th Cir. 1977), *cert. denied in relevant part sub nom., Alabama v. Pugh*, 438 U.S. 781 (1978); *Battle v. Anderson*, 376 F. Supp. 402 (E.D. Okla. 1974), *subsequent opinion*, 447 F. Supp. 516 (1977), *aff'd*, 564 F.2d 388 (10th Cir. 1977); *Gates v. Collier*, 349 F. Supp. 881 (N.D. Miss. 1972), *aff'd*, 501 F.2d 1291 (5th Cir. 1974); and *Holt v. Sarver*, 309 F. Supp. 362 (E.D. Ark. 1970), *aff'd*, 442 F.2d 304 (8th Cir. 1971). The evidence shows that the conditions at the Canon Correctional Facility — in virtually all areas except the new administration building[23] — regarding hygiene and sanitation, heat, ventilation, weather-proofing, fire protection, lighting and plumbing have long been serious problems, and that many

---

(Footnote 22 continued)

> The MCC differs markedly from the familiar image of a jail; there are no barred cells, dank, colorless corridors, or clanging steel gates. [Constructed in 1975,] [i]t was intended to include the most advanced and innovative features of modern design of detention facilities. As the Court of Appeals stated: '[I]t represented the architectural penological planning.' 573 F2d at 121. The key design element of the 12-story structure is the 'modular' or 'unit' concept, whereby each floor designed to house inmates has only one or two largely self-contained residential units that replace the traditional cellblock jail construction. Each unit in turn has several cluster or corridors of private rooms or dormitories radiating from a central 2-story 'multipurpose' or common room, to which each inmate has free access approximately 16 hours a day.

Id., 99 S. Ct. at 1866-67, 60 L.Ed.2d at 459-60. In addition to the relatively short seven or eight hour periods during which prisoners or detaiees were required to remain in their cells, 50% of *all* MCC inmates spent less than 30 days at the facility . . . [and], of the unsentenced detainees, over half spent less than 10 days at the MCC [and] three quarters were released within a month . . . ." *Id.*, 99 S.Ct. at 1866 n.3, 60 L.Ed.2d at 549 n. 3.

[23] This includes cellhouses, common and program areas, and kitchen facilities.

are outright dangers to health and safety. The physical facilities are in such a state of age, disrepair and obsolescence that numerous experts and officials, including defendants, have concluded that the massive renovation that would be required to make the Canon Correctional Facility habitable is both physically and economically impractical. The conditions are grossly inadequate and constitutionally impermissible.

PHYSICAL SAFETY

In *Woodhous v. Commonwealth of Virginia*, 487 F.2d 889, 890 (4th Cir. 1973), the Fourth Circuit said that "[a] prisoner has a right, secured by the Eighth Amendments, to be reasonably protected from constant threat of violence and sexual assault by his fellow inmates, and he need not wait until he is actually assaulted to obtain relief." Other courts have agreed. *See Williams v. Edwards*, 547 F.2d at 1213; *Palmigiano v. Garrahy*, 443 F. Supp. at 980; and *Pugh v. Locke*, 406 F. Supp. at 329-30.[24] While violence at Old Max has been significantly reduced, the threat of occurrence is omnipresent. The random design and construction of Old Max has caused a large number of blind spots where violence and other illicit activities can go on completely unobserved. Four reports have concluded that the physical layout of the prison makes it virtually impossible to provide safety.[25]

No matter what physical changes are made, the grossly inadequate staff could never cure the problem. The staff which does exist is largely preoccupied with self-protection and maintaining control of the prison. While various reports have recommended substantial increases in staffing, secur-

---

[24] The Colorado Court of Appeals has recognized the state's duty to assure inmate safety and has permitted prisoners who have fled from Canon City, after allegedly being beaten and raped, to raise the state's failure to protect as a defense to the crime of escape. *See Colorado v. Trujillo*, ____ Colo. App. ____, 586 P.2d 235 (1978).

[25] While the certified plaintiff class only includes inmates at the Canon Correctional Facility, the prison staff also has a very real and legitimate interest in their own safety, which is likewise ill-served by the prison's condition.

ity staff at the Canon Correctional Facility actually decreased in fiscal year 1978-79. While prison security is not the only goal, it is a central one, *Pell v. Procunier*, 417 U.S. at 823, and effective programs cannot be implemented except in an environment in which both staff and inmates are reasonably secure. The lack of safety at Old Max deprives prisoners of one right and prevents the fulfillment of others.

IDLENESS

While there is no constitutional right to rehabilitation, the law of this circuit is clear that the Eighth Amendment protects an inmate "from an environment where degeneration is probable and self-improvement unlikely because of the conditions existing which inflict needless suffering, whether physical or mental." *Battle v. Anderson*, 564 F.2d at 403.[26] Idleness at the Canon Correctional Facility is pervasive, and "[t]he sad truth is that Colorado is now operating its maximum security prison by locking down prisoners for substantial periods of time in 2 of its 3 major cellblocks (cellhouses 3 and 7)." Plaintiffs' Trial Brief, at 25. In addition, a 1973 American Correctional Association report found that idleness was responsible for more problems at Old Max than any other factor. Rather then improving, idleness at Old Max has worsened progressively. Prison industries have been discontinued, educational programs cut back, and other constructive activities, such as discussion or self-help groups, limited. I cannot, and will not, "second guess" the prison administrators in trying to say which of these individual decisions might have been unjustified. The fact is that the overall effect is to creat conditions of idleness and lockdown that make degeneration likely and self-improvement impossible.

I have stated elsewhere, and I will hazard saying it again, that the above conditions are not being imposed as a

---

[26] The Supreme court has said that a "paramount objective of the corrections system is the rehabilitation of those committed to its custody." *Pell v. Procunier*, 417 U.S. at 823.

matter of short-term disciplinary action.[27] Instead, the system at Old Max imposes its own form of Catch-22 on a vast number of the inmate population. "Transitional workers" are inmates who are eligible for jobs but are idle because not enough jobs are available. As a result, they spend up to 20 hours a day in their cells and cannot participate in various other activities because they are not workers. They are not workers only because the prison does not provide jobs.[28]

The same situation is true of inmates in protective custody: they are there because confinement in the general population would be unsafe, not because they are otherwise ineligible to participate in productive activities. Courts have recognized that where the prison system itself has

> created the conditions that necessitate the widespread use of protective custody, where the totality of conditions of protective custody violate the Eighth Amendment, and where the restrictions complained of amount to additional punishment for which no penological explanation is offered, the additional restrictions are offensive to due process and equal protection and must be enjoined.

Palmigiano v. Garrahy, 443 F. Supp. at 982 (citations omitted).

Finally, the same applies to those inmates who are in administrative segregation in cellhouse 3 not as punishment but because of special management problems. Perhaps a number of those inmates should not be at the Canon Correctional Facility at all,[29] but there is no legitimate reason for their categorical exclusion from productive activity.

---

[27] Of course, disciplinary confinement is also subject to constitutional limitations. *See, e.g., Hutto v. Finney*, 437 U.S. 678 (1978), *Gregory v. Wyse*, 512 F.2d 378 (10th Cir. 1975); *Battle v. Anderson*, 376 F. Supp. at 422, 423-24.

[28] In addition, because they are not workers, they cannot earn statutory good time credit. *See* C.R.S., §17-20-107 (1973).

[29] *See* opinion at 54-55, *infra*.

Colorado has provided by statute that "[e]very able-bodied offender shall be put to and kept at the work most suitable to his capacity and most advantageous to the people of this state." C.R.S., §17-20-117 (1978). *Also see* C.R.S., §17-20-115 (1978). In the legislative delcaration of the Correctional Industries Act, the general assembly has stated:

> The general assembly hereby finds and declares that the means now provided for the employment of offenders are inadequate to allow a forty-hour-week work assignment for all able-bodied offenders and for correctional industries programs to be operated on a financially profitable basis. Therefore, it is the intent of the general assembly in this article to:
>
> (a) Create a division of correctional industries. . . which assumes responsibility for training offenders in general work habits, work skills, and specific training skills that increase their employment prospects when released;
>
> (b) Develop industries that provide forty hours of work activity each week for all able-bodied offenders; [and]
>
> (c) Provide an environment for the operation of correctional industries that closely resembles the environment for the business operations of a private corporate entity;. . .

C.R.S., §17-24-102(1) (1978).[30] While the Constitution may

---

[30] The correctional industries program is not a recent response to problems at the Canon Correctional Facility. It was originally enacted in 1965, when the legislature declared that "the means [then] provided for the employment of prison labor [were] inadequate to furnish a sufficient number of prisoners with employment." Correctional Industries Act of 1965, C.R.S., §105-8-1 (1965) (later C.R.S. §27-25-102 (1973)). In emphasizing the purpose that "all provisions of this article shall be construed to rehabilitate prisoners with the intent of placing released prisoners back in society in a useful, productive manner," *id.*, it is significant that 12 years later, when the general assembly recodified the program at C.R.S., §17-24-101 (1977), it would still find employment opportunities inadequate. While some improvements were made during the 12 year period, the evidence in this case makes it highly questionable that inmate employment during recent years has even approximated what it was in 1965.

not specifically require that all prisoners be provided jobs, Colorado does. *Cf. Palmigiano v. Garrahy*, 443 F. Supp. at 980.

In prison condition cases, courts have not hesitated to order officials to provide meaningful educational programs. *See, e.g., Palmigiano v. Garrahy*, 443 F. Supp. at 989; *Laaman v. Helgemoe*, 437 F. Supp. at 329-30; *Mitchel v. Untreiner*, 421 F. Supp. 886, 901 (N.D. Fla. 1976); and *Alberti v. Sheriff of Harris County*, 406 F. Supp. 649, 673 (S.D. Tex. 1975). One civilian teacher for a population of 800-900 prisoners and an effective budget of $3,000 is ridiculous even as a joke much less as a reality.

Recreation programs at Old Max are limited and the vast majority of these are athletic in character. Access to the gym is limited even for those in the general population, and almost nonexistent for those in the "special" populations such as administrative segregation and protective custody. While "sophisticated" programs may not be required, "the right to reasonable opportunities for exercise is fundamental." *Laaman v. Helgemoe*, 437 F. Supp. at 309. *Accord, Palmigiano v. Garrahy*, 443 F. Supp. at 981; *Moore v. Janing*, 427 F. Supp. 567, 574-75 (D.Neb. 1976). Especially here, where prison life for most inmates is characterized by idleness and prolonged daily confinement in their cells, adequate exercise is critical. *See Battle v. Anderson*, 376 F. Supp. at 424. Its relationship to the maintenance of health is obvious.

HEALTH CARE

Of the many problems at Old Max, the blatant inadequacy of health care is perhaps the most appalling — despite the fact that courts have recognized that inmates have a fundamental right to receive needed care. *See Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. at 103-05; *Todaro v. Ward*, 565 F. 2d 48, 52-53 (2d Cir. 1977); *Palmigiano v. Garrahy*, 443 F. Supp. at 983-84; *Laaman v. Helgemoe*, 437 F. Supp. at 311-15; and *Battle v. Anderson*, 376 F. Supp. at 424. As the Supreme Court said in *Estelle*:

> An inmate must rely on prison authorities to treat his medical needs; if the authorities fail to do so, those needs will not be met. In the worst cases, such a failure may actually produce physical 'torture or a lingering death,' . . . . In less serious cases, denial of medical care may result in pain and suffering which no one suggests would serve any penological purpose. Cf. Gregg v. Georgia, supra, at 173. . . . The infliction of such unnecessary suffering is inconsistent with contemporary standards of decency as manifested in modern legislation codifying the common-law view that 'It is but just that the public be required to care for the prisoner, who cannot by reason of the deprivation of his liberty, care for himself.'

429 U.S. at 103-04 (citations and footnotes omitted).

The failures of Old Max extend across the board from inadequate staff and resources to insufficient transportation arrangements to lack of training and qualification of the limited staff that does exist. The problem is not simply a matter of isolated incidents of alleged negligence or difference of opinion. It is a matter of such large scale failure as to evidence deliberate indifference to serious health needs. As I ruled from the bench, I consider the health care problems at Old Max an emergency situation and a matter of first importance.

Staffing is grossly inadequate. The primary care physician who has responsibility for the entire medical program is paid on a part-time basis and spends only three to five hours a week at the prison on actual patient care. Physician assistants who are not registered nurses are often the only persons on hand. There is no provision for qualified care on a 24-hour a day, 7-day a week basis. A psychiatrist sometimes comes to the prison once a month, and there is not a single Ph.D. trained psychologist on the prison staff. There are only three mental health counselors and none are Colorado-licensed as qualified clinicians. Mental health "treatment" is at best a matter of crisis intervention. The overall shortage of qualified staff endangers the health of the inmate population and is of constitutional magnitude. *See, e.g., Laaman v. Helgemoe,* 437 F. Supp. at 312; *Battle v. Anderson,* 376 F. Supp. at

415-16. *Also see Battle v. Anderson,* 457 F. Supp. 719, 727-29 (E.D. Okla. 1978).

Because health services at Old Max are so limited, almost any substantial sort of medical, dental or psychiatric care must be performed elsewhere, primarily at the State Hospital in Pueblo. There is a single vehicle for transportation of inmates to Pueblo, and it is subject to competing uses, causing serious backlogs of persons waiting for needed care. Space for mental health problems from Old Max is severely limited at the State Hospital, causing most inmates suffering from those problems to be "warehoused" in administrative segregation, subject to the debilitating conditions of cellhouse 3. This is true despite the fact that Colorado law provides for the transfer of these inmates to mental health facilities.

> If. . . the executive director is of the opinion that [a] prisoner is mentally ill or retarded and cannot be well taken care of in the Colorado state reformatory or the state penitentiary, it is his duty to place said mentally ill or retarded prisoner without delay in an institution for the care and treatment of the mentally ill or retarded, there to be treated and confined . . . .

C.R.S. §17-23-101(2) (1978). The evidence is compelling that inmates with mental health needs "cannot be well taken care of" at Old Max.[31]

Finally, despite indications that the vast majority of inmates come to the Canon Correctional Facility with drug and alcohol problems, treatment programs are wholly inadequate and do not conform to the purpose of C.R.S., §25-1-304 (1978) to establish programs in conjunction with the Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse of the Department of Health.

CLASSIFICATION

While there is no constitutional right to classification as such, a valid classification system provides a reasonable

---

[31] On the rights of mentally ill persons in state custody, *see generally Romero v. Schauer,* 386 F. Supp. 851 (D. Colo. 1974) (three-judge court).

method by which prison officials can protect and afford to inmates other constitutional rights such as safety and medical care. As the district court said in *Palmigiano v. Garrahy*, 443 F. Supp. at 965 (footnote omitted):

> Classification is essential to the operation of an orderly and safe prison. It is a prerequisite for the rational allocation of whatever program opportunities exist within the institution. It enables the institution to gauge the proper custody level of an inmate, to identify the inmate's educational, vocational and psychological needs, and to separate non-violent inmates from the more predatory. These goals are recognized by state law, which provides that classification shall serve a rehabilitative function. Classification is also indispensable for any coherent future planning.

Accord, Doe v. Lally, 467 F. Supp. 1339, 1353 (D.Md. 1979); *Pugh v. Locke*, 406 F. Supp. at 324. When a classification system is established, however, its decisions "cannot be arbitrary, irrational or discriminatory," *Laaman v. Helgemoe*, 437 F. Supp. at 318, since inmates are not deprived of all protection of due process and equal protection. *See Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539,555-56 (1974); *Lee v. Washington*, 390 U.S. 333 (1968) (per curiam); and *Pugh v. Locke*, 406 F. Supp. at 330.[32]

The due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment does not itself create a protected interest in the initial assignment of offenders to a particular place of confinement. Such an interest, if it exists, is created by state law. *See Meachum v. Fano*, 427 U.S. 215, 224-27 (1976); *Montanye v. Haymes*, 427 U.S. 236, 242-43 (1976). Colorado has enacted a diagnostic and classification program at C.R.S., §17-40-102 (1978). In doing so, the general assembly said:

---

[32] *Cf. Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153, 188-89 (1976); *Furman v. Georgia*, 408 U.S. 238, 242-57, 274-77, 309-10, 312-13, 363-66 (1972) (concurring opinions of Douglas, Brennan, Stewart, White and Marshall, JJ., respectively) (infliction of severe punishment unconstitutional where arbitrary, capricious or discriminatory).

> The primary function and purpose of the program shall be to provide a diagnostic examination and evaluation of all offenders sentenced by the courts of this state, so that each such offender may be assigned to a correctional institution which has the type of security and, to the extent possible, appropriate programs of education, employment, and treatment available, which are designed to accomplish maximum rehabilitation of such offender and to prepare an offender for placement into as productive an employment as possible following inprisonment.

Id. at 17-40-102(2). All offenders are to be processed through the diagnostic services which have been centralized at the Canon Correctional Facility in order to identify their treatment and employment needs. A recommendation is then made as to their place of confinement. *See* C.R.S. 1973 §§16-11-308 and 17-40-103 (1978). I have held in a somewhat related case that Colorado law and regulation create a protected liberty interest in classification decisions. *See Marioneaux v. Colorado State Penitentiary*, 456 F. Supp. 1245, 1248 (D.Colo. 1979). *Accord, Gurule v. Wilson*, Consolidated Civil Action No. 74-A-926 (D. Colo. April 3, 1978). *Cf. Palmigiano v. Garahy*, 443 F. Supp. at 980-82; *Anderson v. Redman*, 429 F. Supp. 1105, 1121-22 (D. Del. 1977). It is well-established that "due process is flexible and calls for such procedural protections as the particular situation demands." *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, 481 (1972). In according deference to prison officials and accommodating "institutional needs and objectives and the provisions of the Constitution," *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. at 556, due process does not require a hearing at the initial classification stage. *See Laaman v. Helgemoe*, 437 F. Supp. at 319. Interviews with an inmate will be part of the process, and the statutes require that a requesting inmate generally be shown a copy of the recommendation and receive an explanation. *See* C.R.S., §§16-11-308(4) and 17-40-103(2) (1978).[33] Due process and equal protection do require that a

---

[33] Due process requires more where disciplinary proceedings are involved, *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539 (1974), or where inmates are regressively classified. *Marioneaux v. Colorado State Penitentiary*, 465 F. Supp. 1245, 1248 (D. Colo. 1979).

classification system bear some rational relationship to the object being sought. Defendants have said that a classification system that separates prisoners by "age, offense, physical aggressiveness or other criteria" is constitutionally valid, citing *Goldsby v. Carnes*, 365 F. Supp. 395, 402 (W.D.Mo. 1973), *modified by consent*, 429 F. Supp. 370 (W.D.Mo. 1977). As a general proposition, I agree. There are a number of ways that inmates might be classified in a manner that comports with due process and equal protection. But the evidence in this case raises substantial doubt about the validity of the classification system which defendants have adopted. No acceptable validation study has been performed, and Dr. Eber admits that the predictions are so poor that they should only be used in making initial decisions and then only when no other significant information is available. After that, says Dr. Eber, classification decisions should be based on an inmate's actual behavior.[34]

The basic failure of the diagnostic and case management program at Old Max is that the information is almost meaningless in making facility assignments and in affording inmates the various program opportunities which the diagnostic survey has recommended. The evidence shows that overclassification is the rule, not the exception, and that large numbers of inmates are housed at Old Max even though they have been classified for lesser security facilities.[35] In fact, actual departmental regulations make the diagnostic recommendation totally irrelevant where, for instance, an inmate has more than six years remaining before parole eligibility. In such cases, the inmate is automatically confined at Old Max.[36] Finally, no matter what

---

[34] I do not hold that an offender has a protected interest in any particular classification decision. Once a classification procedure is validated in an acceptable manner, individual decisions will not be subject to review except on a showing of abuse or bad faith in its application.

[35] Both situations — overclassification and "over"-assignment — are evidenced by the planned capacity at the new maximum security facility of approximately 340 as compared to the present Old Max population of 850 inmates.

[36] Defendants have said that a "variance" from this regulation is possible, but the evidence shows that only a relative handful have been granted.

rehabilitation or vocational program is recommended, the evidence shows that the diagnostic procedure is mostly in vain, since programs are not in fact available. Though capable of redemption, the classification system is presently unconstitutional.

ACCESS

The Supreme Court of the United States has held that "a prison inmate retains those First Amendment rights that are not inconsistent with his status as a prisoner or with the legitimate penological objectives of the corrections system." *Pell v. Procunier*, 417 U.S. at 822. Although the fact of confinement and the needs of the prison may impose some limitations on the inmate's constitutional rights, restrictions must be reasonable and must be justified by legitimate policies and goals of the corrections system. *See Jones v. North Carolina Prisoners' Union*, 433 U.S. at 129-30.

Restrictions on visitation are particularly critical since they may prevent inmates from maintaining meaningful family bonds and community ties which promote rehabilitation and successful return to society. As the district court said in *Pugh v. Locke*, 406 F. Supp. at 327:

> The chances of successful rehabilitation or the chances of escaping mental and physical degeneration are also diminished by the fact that prison environment is much different from that in the society to which an inmate must return. Current visitation policies discourage visits — which are essential to the maintenance of community ties — and therefore decrease an inmate's chances of successful reintegration upon release.

Accord, Laaman v. Helgemoe, 437 F. Supp. at 320; *Wesson v. Johnson*, ____ *Colo.* ____ , 579 P.2d 1165 (1978) (en banc) (pretrial detainees).

Restrictions on family visits must be accommodated with clear constitutional protection of family life. The Supreme Court recently surveyed this area in *Moore v. City of East Cleveland*, 431 U.S. 494 (1977) and stated at 499:

> 'This Court has long recognized that freedom of personal choice in matters of marriage and family life is one of the liberties protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.' *Cleveland Board of Education v. LaFleur*, 414 U.S. 632, 639-640 (1974). A host of cases, tracing their lineage to *Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390, 399-401 (1923), and *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510, 534-535 (1925), have consistently acknowledged a 'private realm of family life which the state cannot enter.' *Prince v. Massachusetts*, 321 U.S. 158, 166 (1944). See, *e.g.*, *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113, 152-153 (1973); *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205, 231-233 (1972); *Stanley v. Illinois*, 405 U.S. 645, 651 (1972); *Ginsberg v. New York*, 390 U.S. 629, 639 (1968); *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965); *id.*, at 495-496 (Goldberg, J., concurring); *id.*, at 502-503 (White, J., concurring); *Poe v. Ullman*, 367 U.S. 497, 542-544, 549-553 (1961) (Harlan, J., dissenting); *cf. Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1, 12 (1967); *May v. Anderson*, 345 U.S. 528, 533 (1953); *Skinner v. Oklahoma ex rel. Williamson*, 316 U.S. 535, 541 (1942). Of course, the family is not beyond regulation. See *Prince v. Massachusetts*, *supra*, at 166. But when the government intrudes on choices concerning family living arrangements, this Court must examine carefully the importance of the governmental interests advanced and the extent to which they are served by the challenged regulation. See *Poe v. Ullman*, *supra*, at 554 (Harlan, J., dissenting).

As with other constitutional protections, some of these are withdrawn to varying degrees when a person is legally incarcerated as punishment. The most obvious are those involving procreation, since conjugal visits are not yet recognized as a constitutional right. But other family interests survive, and like First Amendment ones, can only be limited on account of important governmental interests and only by restrictions which are not unnecessarily broad. *Cf. Procunier v. Martinez*, 416 U.S. 396, 413-14 (1974).

The present restrictions on family visits at Canon City are overbroad and prevent or impair meaningful visitation without being necessary to any legitimate penological pur-

pose. Individual cases which present security problems or in which there has been a previous abuse of visitation rights may be dealt with by prison officials by means other than blanket restrictions on all inmates. Where there is a valid reason to believe that visitation rights have been abused in a particular case, prison officials may take reasonable steps to investigate and, if necessary, to correct the situation, but a general, undifferentiated suspicion of all inmates, all visitors and all visits does not allow the overbroad procrustean restraints which are presently in effect. Those restraints are an exaggerated and excessive response to concerns for prison security.

The Constitution affords less protection to visits by those who are not family members. Restrictions on the freedom to associate are predictable consequences of incarceration. Prison security justifies greater restrictions on these visits than those involving family. *See generally Hardwick v. Ault*, 447 F. Supp. at 131; *Laaman v. Helgemoe*, 437 F. Supp. at 320-22; and *Hamilton v. Saxbe*, 428 F. Supp. 1101, 11091113 (N.D. Ga. 1976). Still, an absolute ban on visits by nonrelatives is not a regulation "wisely adapted to individual circumstances . . . or included in general rules which allow prisoners reasonable visitation." *Newman v. Alabama*, 559 F.2d 283, 291 (5th Cir. 1977), *cert. denied in relevant part sub nom. Alabama v. Pugh*, 438 U.S. 781 (1978). Visits by certain individuals may have a strong positive effect on an inmate's chances for rehabilitation and prevent deterioration of both mental health and important bonds to law-abiding citizens outside the walls. Restriction to a limited number of screened and approved nonrelative visitors is allowable, as is restriction on the number of visits that each such person can have each month. Present regulations at the Canon Correctional Facility allow three nonrelative visitors only when a prisoner does not have family in Colorado. The regulation is overly broad. Non-relative visitors should be allowed to visit those inmates who do have family in the state and should be allowed at least one visit during a reasonable span of time such as once a month. Approval of these visitors is subject to procedural safeguards such as notice of disapproval and an opportunity for review. *See Laaman v. Helgemoe*, 437 F. Supp. at 321, 330; *Hamilton v. Saxbe*, 428 F. Supp. at 1112-13.

The constitutional considerations regarding restrictions on correspondence are similar to those regarding visitation:

> First, the regualtion or practice in question must further an important or substantial governmental interest unrelated to the suppression of expression. Prison officials may not censor inmate correspondence simply to eliminate unflattering or unwelcome opinions or factually inaccurate statements. Rather, they must show that a regulation authorizing mail censorship furthers one or more of the substantial governmental interests of security, order, and rehabilitation. Second, the limitation of First Amendment freedoms must be no greater than necessary or essential to the protection of the particular governmental interest involved. Thus a restriction of inmate correspondence that furthers an important or substantial interest of penal administration will nevertheless be invalid if its sweep is unnecessarily broad.

Procunier v. Martinez, 416 U.S. 396, 413-14 (1974).

General correspondence to and from inmates is subject to being read and inspected, but only according to specific and well-defined criteria and when accompanied by adequate procedural safeguards. *See Procunier v. Martinez*, 416 U.S. at 413-19; *Guajardo v. Estelle*, 580 F.2d 748, 56-57 (5th Cir. 1978); *McKinney v. De Bord*, 507 F.2d 501, 505 (9th Cir. 1974); *Hardwick v. Ault*, 447 F. Supp. 116, 128-30 (M.D. Ga. 1978); and *Minnesota Civil Liberties Union v. Schoen*, 448 F. Supp. 960, 966 (D. Minn. 1977). To be legitimate, "censorship" must focus *only* on matters which are important governmental concerns, such as interception of information concerning proposed criminal activity or encoded messages, and not on matters such as "statements that 'unduly complain' or 'magnify grievances,' " *Procunier v. Martinez*, 416 U. S. at 396, or that involve " 'improper language' or 'gossip,' " *Battle v. Anderson*, 376 F. Supp. at 425, or that personally offend the censor. *Hardwick v. Ault*, 447 F. Supp. at 131. Not only are such concerns unjustified, but vague and general proscriptions invite too much discretion. Procedural

safeguards require that an inmate be notified of the rejection of a letter written by or addressed to him, that the writer be given a reasonable opportunity to protest the decision, and that complaints be referred to a prison official other than the person who originally disapproved the correspondence. *See Procunier v. Martinez*, 416 U.S. at 418-19; *Battle v. Anderson*, 376 F. Supp. at 425.[37] A notice that certain correspondence has been rejected must include a brief but adequate explanation, and the rejected correspondence must be returned to the sender. Regulations at the Canon Correctional Facility meet these standards.

With regard to receipt of publications through the mail, Canon Correctional Facility officials prohibit inmates from receiving periodicals and other materials that are not mailed directly from the publisher of an established vendor or distributor. This issue was recently addressed by the Supreme Court in *Bell v. Wolfish*, ____ *U.S. at* ____, 99 S.Ct. at 1879-81, 60 L.Ed.2d at 475-77, but the only rule that emerges from that decision is that "a prohibition against receipt of hardback books unless mailed directly from publishers, book clubs or bookstores does not violate the First Amendment rights of. . . inmates." *Id.*, ____ U.S. at ____, 99 S.Ct. at 1880, 60 L.Ed.2d at 476.[38]

A recent Tenth Circuit decision is somewhat more general. In *Woods v. Daggett*, 541 F.2d 237 (10th Cir. 1976), the court of appeals upheld a publisher-only rule as applied to prisoners' receipt of published materials, finding that the rule met the standards set forth in *Procunier v. Martinez* and

---

[37] The scope of these protections include restrictions or censorship based on the identity or character of correspondents; the interested correspondents, as well as the inmate, must be given notice and provided the safeguards set forth above. *See Battle v. Anderson*, 376 F. Supp. at 425.

[38] Subsequent to the court of appeal decision, the Bureau of Prisons had amended its rule to permit the receipt of publications also from bookstores and proposed to amend the rule further to allow paperbacks and other soft-covered materials to be received from any source. *Bell v. Wolfish*, ____ U.S. at ____, 99 S.Ct. at 1879, 60 L.Ed.2d at 475. The question whether the original rule was constitutional was therefore not before the court.

discussed above. *Accord, Guajrado v. Estelle*, 580 F.2d at 762.[39] The Canon Correctional Facility rule is allowable.

Plaintiffs also attack two more particular restrictions on correspondence. The first is defendants' policy of refusing to deliver mail in a language other than English, and the second is a practice of limiting receipt of mail when certain correspondence would allegedly cause severe psychiatric or emotional distrubance to an inmate. As to the former, I have stated elsewhere that inmates do not forfeit the safeguards provided by equal protection. *See, e.g., Lee v. Washington*, 390 U.S. 333 (1968) (per curiam). A third of the population at Old Max is Hispanic and the English language rule seriously infringes protected First and Fourteenth Amendment interests without being necessary to any legitimate penological purpose. If prison officials are concerned that secret messages might be passed in Spanish, it is incumbent on a state with such a large Hispanic population to utilize a person capable of understanding Spanish to perform the censoring function or else forego it. The rule is unconstitutional.

The second of the restrictions is not wholly unreasonable on its face, but the anomaly is that there is no qualified psychiatrist or psychologist at the prison to make a decision whether receipt of certain correspondence would cause severe psychological disturbance. Until such time as there is, the rule is void and may not be applied.

---

[39] The specific publications involved in *Woods v. Daggett*, 541 F.2d 237 (10th Cir. 1976), were law books, access to which is entitled to greater protection than general reading materal. Even so, the publisher-only rule was upheld.

The rule does not cause books and other materials to be limited to those which an inmate himself can afford. Relatives and friends can pay for and order books, including paperbacks, from publishers or established vendors and distributors, and have them delivered directly to the Canon Correctional Facility. CCF REGULATION 302-18(12). Books are not counted against an inmate's package limit. *Id.*

I note, however, that unless adequate library facilities are soon provided for all inmates, I will reconsider this portion of my decision and order any additional relief that appears appropriate.

The constitutional rules are different where privileged correspondence such as mail to or from a court or attorney is involved. Outgoing privileged mail cannot be opened *at all*, *Guajardo v. Estelle*, 580 F.2d at 757-59; *Taylor v. Sterrett*, 532 F.2d 462, 473-78 (5th Cir. 1976), except on reasonable and specific cause to believe that contraband or improper communication is involved. *See, e.g., Taylor v. Sterrett*, 532 F.2d at 475; and *Hardwick v. Ault*, 447 F. Supp. at 475. General, undifferentiated suspicion is not sufficient cause, and such determination of cause and the interception of privileged mail will be subject to the same procedural safeguards as those regarding general correspondence. Apart from such exceptional circumstances, prison officials may take reasonable steps to verify that addressed persons are in fact privileged correspondents, *see, e.g., Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. at 576-77, *Guajardo v. Estelle*, 580 F.2d at 758-59, so long as those steps do not cause unnecessary delay or interference with privileged mail.

Incoming privileged mail is subject to inspection for contraband, *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. at 577, but only in the presence of the inmate. *See Guajardo v. Estelle*, 580 F.2d at 757-59; *Hardwick v. Ault*, 447 F. Supp. at 130; and *Carty v. Fenton*, 440 F. Supp. 1161, 1162-63 (M.D. Pa. 1977).[40]

Defendants' regulations comply with these requirements except in two respects. First, the Canon Correctional regulation does not make clear that in those exceptional circumstances when outgoing privileged mail may be opened, it can only be opened in the presence of the sending inmate. Such presence is required. Second, in defining "legal mail," the regulations say that it is "any mail directed between an inmate and any public official or agency or any

---

[40] By way of the same reasonable and specific cause set out above, incoming privileged mail in exceptional circumstances may be read in order to intercept improper communications, but only in the presence of the inmate. Any other communications are immune from censorship.

There is no evidence that gives me reason to doubt the good faith of defendants in this matter, but I mean for these rules and safeguards to be strictly applied. If bad faith or abuse of the allowed measures is shown, I will enter any additional orders that appear necessary to correct the situation.

lawyer with respect to either his criminal conviction *or a complaint he might have concerning the administration of the prison under exceptional circumstances.*" CCF REGULATION 302-18(6) (emphasis added). The latter qualification is not allowable. Legal mail is not subject to review as to the kind of problem or complaint being asserted, or according to the degree or extent of such problem or complaint. Any mail to or from "a licensed attorney who is representing an inmate in a criminal or civil [or administrative] matter, is being contacted to represent or is contemplating representing an inmate in [any such matter]," CCF REGULATION 302-18(6), is legal mail.

It is beyond cavil that prisoners have a constitutional right to meaningful access to the courts, and that states have an affirmative obligation to assure such access. *See Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817 (1977); *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. at 577-80; and *Younger v. Gilmore*, 404 U.S. 15 (1971) (per curiam). As the Supreme Court said in *Bounds v. Smith:*

> [T]he fundamental constitutional right of access to the courts requires prison authorities to assist inmates in the preparation and filing of meaningful legal papers by providing prisoners with adequate law libraries or adequate assistance from persons trained in the law.
>
> . . .
>
> It should be noted that while adequate law libraries are one constitutionally acceptable method to assure meaningful access to the courts, our decision . . . does not foreclose alternative means to achieve that goal. Nearly half the States and the District of Columbia provide some degree of professional or quasiprofessional legal assistance to prisoners. . . . Independent legal advisors can mediate or resolve administratively many prisoner complaints that would otherwise burden the courts, and can convince inmates that other grievances against the prison or the legal system are ill-founded, thereby facilitating rehabilitation by assuring the inmate that he has not been treated unfairly. . . . Nevertheless, a legal access program need not include any

> particular element we have discussed, and we encourage local experiementation. *Any plan, however, must be evaluated as a whole to ascertain its compliance with constitutional standards.*

430 U.S. at 828-32 (citations and footnotes omitted; emphasis added).[41]

Besides *Bounds*, the other important case in this circuit is *Twyman v. Crisp*, 584 F.2d 352 (10th Cir. 1978). In *Twyman*, the court of appeals said that a regulation allowing two hours a week in the law library had not been shown to actually prejudice the named plaintiff's access to the courts. The constitutional holding of the decision is not clear, however, since, while the appeal was pending, the regulation was changed to increase the library time to an average of 11 and one-half hours a week. The court said, in addition to its conclusion above, that "[s]ince the rules have now been changed to provide considerably more time, this claim is without merit." 584 F.2d at 358. In *Bounds*, part of the approved library plan consisted of an average of one full day every three or four weeks, and this was acceptable when accompanied by other available types of assistance, such as trained inmate research assistants and typists. 430 U.S. at 819.

At the Canon Correctional Facility, the maximum number of inmates who may have access to the various law libraries on any given day is 13, totalling 65 for an entire week. Each would have library time of three hours or less.

---

[41] The Supreme Court noted in *Bounds v. Smith* that correctional administrators have widely supported prison legal assistances programs:

> Nearly 95% of the state corrections commissioners, prison wardens, and treatment directors responding to a national survey supported creation and expansion of legal services. . . . Almost 85% believed that the programs would not adversely affect discipline or security or increase hostility toward the institution. Rather, over 80% felt legal services provide a safety valve for inmate grievances, reduce inmate power structures and tensions from unresolved legal problems, and contribute to rehabilitation by providing a positive experience with the legal system.

430 U.S. 817, 829 n. 18 (1977).

With a population of 850 inmates, this would mean a law library capacity of three hours per inmate every 13 weeks. It is fairly certain, of course, that not all inmates will be preparing legal materials at any one time, but even a considerably smaller number of inmate litigants would average only three hours of library time every four to six weeks.[42] That amount of time fails to meet even the two hour a week holding in *Twyman*, as well as the one full day every three to four weeks which the Supreme Court held sufficient in *Bounds*.

Once an inmate gains access to a law library, its contents must be constitutionally adequate. *See Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. at 828; *Battle v. Anderson*, 457 F. Supp. 719, 736 (E.D. Okla. 1978); and *Gilmore v. Lynch*, 319 F. Supp. 105, 111 (N.D. Calif. 1970), *aff'd sub nom. Younger v. Gilmore*, 404 U.S. 15 (1971) (per curiam). The small libraries in cellhouses 3 and 7 are totally inadequate to effective researching and framing of issues. The general population library, while more extensive than the collections in cellhouses 3 and 7, is still inadequate. It contains only half of the volumes recommended by the American Association of Law Libraries Committee on Law Library Services to Prisoners.

Plaintiffs also complain about lack of typewriters and inadequate access to photocopy equipment. Since prisoners are not prejudiced by the filing of handwritten documents, there is no constitutional right to typewriters. *See Twyman v. Crisp*, 584 F.2d at 358; *Stubblefield v. Henderson*, 475 F.2d 26, 26 (5th Cir. 1973). *Also see Wolfish v. Levi*, 573 F.2d 118, 132 (2nd Cir. 1978), *rev'd on other grounds sub nom. Bell v. Wolfish*, ____ U.S. ____, 99 S. Ct. 1861, 60 L.Ed.2d 447 (1979). I have not been able to find a case which holds that inmates have a constitutional right of meaningful access to photocopy equipment, but given serious restraints on library time and a rule that prohibits inmates from taking legal materials out of the library, adequate access to a photo-

---

[42] Sign-up for library time is on a first-come, first-served basis, except that there is an exception for inmates facing court deadlines.

In addition, prison regulations provide that legal materials cannot be "checked out" or removed from the libraries.

copy machine may be called for. As set forth in *Bounds v. Smith*, the question in any particular case is whether a prison's facilities and rules, taken as a whole, provide inmates with meaningfull access to the courts. The Canon Correctional Facility's do not.[43]

"States must shoulder affirmative obligations to assure all prisoners meaningful access to the courts." *Battle v. Anderson*, 457 F. Supp. at 737. I have previously quoted this decision regarding access in holding that "to be meaningful, the right of access to the courts must include the means to frame and present legal issues and relevant facts effectively for judicial consideration." *Mingo v. Patterson*, 455 F. Supp. 1358, 1361 (D.Colo. 1978). It is not required that a penitentiary even have a law library if the state should choose some other means of insuring access. Thus, a state could provide counsel through its public defender system or it could contract with an agency or foundation or law school to provide this service. Here, however, defendants have apparently opted to provide law libraries and inmate assistance. While there are indeed serious and well founded criticisms of the use of this option, it is still constitutionally permissible if minimum standards are met in provisioning the law libraries with adequate books and materials and in maintaining constant vigilance to assure that inmate assistance is neither inadequate nor incompetent. Generally speaking, it takes considerable skill, money and time to maintain an adequate functioning law library. The law libraries at Old Max fall below any known acceptable standards. While it is entirely within the province of the defendants to opt for the law library and inmate legal assistant means of providing access to the courts, the wisdom of choosing it when other more efficient and less expensive means are available is indicative of the environment in which constitutional violations abound.

---

[43] It is also clear that prison officials must provide access to a notary, and not interfere with legal and official mail, except for a limited inspection for contraband as set out above. *See Bryan v. Werner*, 516 F.2d 323 (3rd Cir. 1975).

ORDER

The defendants have not attempted to defend by asserting that plaintiffs' constitutional rights have not been violated. The defense is something in the nature of confession and avoidance. Defendants admit, or concede, that significant violations have existed at least since the mid-1970s. They have argued, instead, that Colorado has made substantial and good faith efforts to resolve what they describe as problems and what I call violations of law. It is not only the constitution and federal law which defendants have violated. There is a veritable litany of state laws and regulations which have been and are being violated.[44]

---

[44] The State of Colorado has violated or failed to pursue the requirements of its own laws set forth in the following statutes or regulations: C.R.S., §§16-8-101 *et seq.* (1978), governing procedures to be followed in dealing with persons found incompetent or insane; C.R.S. §16-11-308(3) (1978), requiring that a recommendation be made by the executive director of the department of corrections as to the place of confinement or rehabilitation program which is the most likely to result in the maximum rehabilitation of an offender; C.R.S., §17-20-115, 117 (1978), requiring that each inmate perform labor most suitable to his capacity and most advantageous to the needs of the state, and that he be paid for his labor; C.R.S., §§17-40-102, 103(1) (1978), defining procedures to be followed in dealing with mentally ill or retarded prisoners; C.R.S., §§17-24-101 *et seq.* (1978), providing rules, regulations, and procedures for the division of correctional industries which provide jobs and other work activities for offenders; C.R.S., §25-90-107 (1973), requiring the state librarian to furnish library services to penal institutions; C.R.S., §25-1-304(1)(d) (1978), calling for cooperation between the division of alcohol and drug abuse and the department of corrections in establishing and conducting programs for the prevention of alcoholism and treatment of alcoholics in corrections institutions; Rules and Regulations Governing Sanitation in Barber Shops in Colorado; 6 CCR 1011-1, setting forth applicable community clinic and emergency medical care requirements such as clinical and emergency services and psychiatric care; 6 CCR 1009-1, providing regulations pertaining to communicable diseases; and C.R.S., §25-5-303 (1973), prohibiting the reuse of any bedding material used by a person having an infectious or contagious disease.

Obedience to law is a two-way street. While I suspect that a number of people have little sympathy for individuals who have violated the law and have been convicted and sentenced to confinement at the Canon Correctional Facility, the state of Colorado and its officials are under no less an obligation to obey both state and federal law. Our system of justice does not have room for the double standard that the acts and omissions of defendants suggest. Nor does it recognize lack of funding as a defense.

Defendants argue that they have made "wrenching" good faith efforts to correct the violations which exist. The evidence does not support the defense. Further, it is well-established that good faith efforts, even wrenching ones, are not a defense to equitable relief from constitutional violations. Nor is lack of financing. The trial court in *Battle v. Anderson* answered these same arguments:

> This Court is well aware of the financial restraints placed on the Defendants and their efforts to comply with the Constitution. But the good will shown by the Defendants cannot serve as a defense. *Finney v. Arkansas Board of Correction, supra; Rozecki v. Gaughan, supra; Holt v. Sarver*, 309 F. Supp. 362, 385 (E.D. Ark. 1970); and *Davis v. Lindsay*, 321 F. Supp. 1134, 1139 (S.D.N.Y. 1970). Nor is the lack of financing a defense to a failure to provide minimum constitutional standards. *Jackson v. Bishop*, 404 F.2d 571, 580 (8th Cir. 1968); *Finney v. Arkansas Board of Corrections, supra* at 199; *Alberti v. Sheriff of Harris County, Texas, supra* at 669; and *Hamilton v. Love, supra* at 1194. If the State of Oklahoma wishes to hold the inmates in institutions, it must provide the funds to maintain the inmates in a constitutionally permissible manner.

447 F. Supp. at 526. The Tenth Circuit not only affirmed the trial court's order, but specifically agreed that even "significant progress" by Oklahoma was not a defense to continuing constitutional violations.

> We agree with the Trial Court finding, that while the State of Oklahoma has made significant progress in correcting many of the abuses and/or providing for new or additional facilities, personnel and programs within its penal system, still the State has not prevented the degenerated . . . conditions which have come to pass at the Oklahoma State Penitentiary at McAlester and at the Oklahoma State Reformatory at Granite.

564 F.2d at 402. Other courts have agreed. *See, e.g., Smith v. Sullivan*, 553 F.2d 373, 378 (5th Cir. 1977); *Gates v. Collier*, 501 F.2d at 1319-20; *Rozecki v. Gaughan*, 459 F.2d 6, 8 (1st

Cir. 1972); *Doe v. Lally*, 467 F. Supp. at 1351; *Palmigiano v. Garrahy*, 443 F. Supp. at 985; *Pugh v. Locke*, 406 F. Supp. at 330-31; and *Holt v. Sarver*, 309 F. Supp. at 385. As I said in ruling from the bench, the Constitution does not permit cruel and unusual punishment today on the theory that somewhere down the line it might be corrected. To quote from Judge Henley's landmark decision in *Holt v. Sarver*, 309 F. Supp. at 383, "[t]he handwriting is on the wall, and it ought not to require a Daniel to read it."

A number of other themes have been presented by the defendants which require some comment. The first, and most frequently recurring, is that the state has spent significant sums for the construction of new maximum and close security facilities designed in accordance with the most enlightened concepts known to date. First, however, a future facility does nothing to eliminate present violations. Second, the proposed facility will not increase the capacity of state correctional facilities. There has been no showing that the present or proposed facilities are adequately staffed; that the staff is adequately trained; that staff training will continue; that adequate health services will be provided; that idleness will be eliminated or that organization will permit personnel to comply with stated job responsibilities without interference or futility. Indeed, the meager evidence presented on these points suggests that the new facilities may very well aggravate rather mitigate the problems which presently exist.

The second theme which defendants have offered is that they have had to make choices under very restrictive conditions. Defendants assert that they have employed a utilitarian calculus to obtain maximum results from limited resources. Thus, defendants say that they have concentrated their efforts and resources on the places where such would accomplish the most. Defendants directed these efforts and resources to minimum security and medium security institutions, since these institutions require less resources and successful results are more easily realized. The decision may indeed be described as rational and intelligent, but it was made at a cost which cannot be accepted. The decisions obviously did not include consideration of the quintessential

question which all republican governments must address; that is, does the constitution permit or prohibit this course of action? The utilitarian calculus does not provide a means by which that question may be answered. Instead of giving proper consideration to the rights of individuals, the decision was harnessed to a balance sheet. The results of this process are there for everyone to see. Indeed, if the Colorado Department of Corrections were Dorian Gray, the Canon Correctional Facility would be its portrait.

In granting relief for violation of prisoners' constitutional rights, courts have taken a number of approaches. Some have entered comprehensive orders, detailing their requirements and setting up timetables for compliance. *See, e.g., Pugh v. Locke*, 406 F. Supp. at 331-32, *modified in relevant part and remanded sub nom. Newman v. Alabama*, 559 F.2d at 290; *Jones v. Wittenberg*, 73 F.R.D. 82 (N.D. Ohio 1976). *Also see Jones v. Wittenberg*, 440 F. Supp. 60 (N.D. Ohio 1977). In *Palmigiano v. Garrahy*, 443 F. Supp. at 986-89, the district court entered a comprehensive order and mandated that the unconstitutional facility be closed within one year. The court appointed a special master to file monthly reports and gave him extensive authority to oversee and implement compliance, including the authority to recommend staff hiring and transfers. Judge Johnson, faced with repeated delay and recalcitrance in *Newman v. Alabama*, 466 F. Supp. 628, 635-39 (M.D. Ala. 1979), appointed the governor of Alabama as receiver for the prison system and transferred all corrections' responsibilities and functions directly to the governor's office.

Still other courts have ordered population reductions in overcrowded prison facilities, *see, e.g., Battle v. Anderson*, 447 F. Supp. at 526, *aff'd*, 564 F.2d at 398-403, while others have ordered institutions to be closed. *See, e.g., Battle v. Anderson*, 457 F. Supp. at 738-39, *Palmigiano v. Garrahy*, 443 F. Supp. at 986; and *Gates v. Collier*, 407 F. Supp. 1117, 1122-23 (N.D. Miss. 1975), *aff'd and remanded*, 548 F.2d 1241 (5th Cir. 1977). In *Hutto v. Finney*, 437 U.S. 678, 687-88 (1978), the Supreme Court recently affirmed the broad equitable power of lower federal courts to remedy continuing constitutional violations, expecially where defendants have had repeated opportunities to resolve the problems them-

selves. The court recognized the interdependence of many prison violations and held that the comprehensive order entered by the district court was justified.

These remedies are available should they become necessary. In the first instance, however, most courts have provided state defendants with an initial opportunity to put their own house in order by presenting a plan that assures immediate attention to bringing a corrections system into constitutional compliance. *See, e.g., Doe v. Lally*, 467 F. Supp. at 1354-55; *Holt v. Sarver*, 309 F. Supp. 362, 385 (E.D. Ark. 1970), *aff'd*, 442 F.2d 304 (8th Cir. 1971). While this is the first adjudication of large-scale constitutional violations at the Canon Correctional Facility, there is a substantial history of recognized problems and inadequate attention, even indifference, to them, notwithstanding humanitarian efforts by some state officials. None of these problems are recent ones. The institution has been studied again and again, and each of these studies has found serious deficiencies. Still another study is not an adequate response. Delay will not be accepted.

No one seriously suggests that prisons should be a desirable place to be. They exist to confine *as punishment* those who have violated the criminal law. Still, as the court of appeals said in *Battle v. Anderson*, 564 F.2d at 403:

> While neither this Court nor the District Court holds to the proposition that prisoners subjected to the punishment of incarceration are entitled to the rights and privileges of one who has not committed a crime against person or property crying out for retribution, still the infliction of cruel and unusual punishment cannot be countenanced in an orderly society. While the rights and privileges necessarily lost — and, in effect, surrendered — by prisoners in punishment for crimes committed are many and varied, they cannot be denied all rights and privileges.

It is abundantly clear that the plaintiff class has suffered from pervasive and frequent violations of federally protected rights. It is uncontradicted by any evidence that Old Max is

unfit for continued human habitation. It is established by clear and convincing evidence that members of the plaintiff class have suffered denials of due process and the infliction of cruel and unusual punishment as a result of some of defendants' practices and procedures and many of defendants' omissions. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Old Max shall be closed. It will no longer be used to confine inmates either temporarily, permanently or on a standby basis. Defendants herein are forever enjoined from confining members of the plaintiff class in the Canon Correctional Facility. It is further

ORDERED that execution of this order shall be stayed for a period of forty five (45) days from the date hereof subject to the following conditions:

1. Defendants must take immediate and continuing steps to cease and desist from maintaining conditions which violate federal and state law and which have been discussed or referred to in this opinion and any of its footnotes.

2. Defendants must present a detailed plan which sets forth the means by which the plaintiff class will be forever protected from further violations of their Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment rights. Such plans must be in furtherance of, but not necessarily limited to the following principles:

a. The Principle of Productive Activity. The selection of programs and the kinds of activities to be used are matters for the defendants to determine. Jobs, recreation, treatment, education, labor and training may all be used to achieve this end. The object is to eliminate forced idleness. Each inmate, including those in the Diagnostic Unit, must be involved in some kind of productive activity at least 8 out of every 24 hours.

b. The Principle of Motility. Excessively restrictive confinement is cruel and unusual punishment. No prisoner, including those in the Diagnostic Unit, may be housed in less than 80 square feet for 20 or more hours a day. If the confining space decreases from 80 square feet, the hours of confinement therein must be reduced proportionately.

c. The Principle of Health. Mental and physical health must be maintained. Treatment and medication, nutrition, exercise and access to others must be provided without delay, without interference by non-medical personnel and at a level equal to the present state of medical art. Preventive medicine and therapy may not be withheld if such would cause or permit deterioration. The environment and food preparation and delivery must meet existing Colorado Health Department standards.

d. The Principle of Integrity and Safety. This principle is directed toward the reduction of stress. Guards and staff may not be worked beyond endurance either because of extensive work hours or insufficient personnel to accomplish needed tasks with due attention to the responsibility to treat inmates fairly and protect them from harm.

e. The Principle of Coherence. This principle means that any systems of classification, placement and assignment must be clearly understandable, consistently applied and conceptually complete. Methods of validation must be implemented and means of redress for irregularity must be provided.

In sum, if defendants wish to obtain relief from this order of closure, they must take immediate steps to provide the plaintiff class, including those in the Diagnostic Unit, with the basic human needs which I have discussed. I believe this is the least intrusive action I can take. It is up to defendants to plan and implement programs. It is up to me to make sure that such programs meet constitutional minima.

If defendants continue to desire relief from this order, I will consider further stays upon a showing that defendants are proceeding without delay in accordance with the principles I have set out and upon a further showing of what steps will be taken during the ensuing stay of execution. It is further

ORDERED that the injunction ordered herein is considered to be a claim separate and apart from other claims, including those for costs and attorneys' fees, within the con-

text of Rule 54(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. There being no just reason for delay, the Clerk of the Court is instructed to enter this Memorandum Opinion and Order forthwith as Judgment in order to make this order immediately appealable. This Memorandum Opinion and Order in no way stays, modifies or amends those emergency orders which I made in my bench ruling. The emergency orders remain in full force and effect and will be treated as such.

DATED at Denver, Colorado this 20th day of December, 1979.

BY THE COURT:

John L. Kane, Jr.
United States District Judge

JUDGMENT OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS DATED SEPTEMBER 25, 1980

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

SEPTEMBER TERM - September 25, 1980

Before Honorable William J. Holloway, Jr., Honorable James E. Barrett, and Honorable James K. Logan, Circuit Judges

FIDEL RAMOS, DAVID LEE ANDERSON, SADIKI LISIMBA AJAMU (a/k/a Eugene Collins), ALEXANDER ROSES, MARK J. MENCHETTI and LESTER LAZENBY, et. al.,	)	
Plaintiffs-Appellees,	)	JUDGMENT
vs.	)	No. 79-2324
THE HONORABLE RICHARD D. LAMM, Governor of the State of Colorado; JAMES G. RICKETTS, Executive Director of the Dept. of Corrections; JOHN PERKO, Director of Div. of Adult Services of Colo. Dept. of Corrections; EDGAR FOX, Dir. of Div. of Correctional Industries of Colo. Dept. of Corrections and WILLIAM WILSON, Supt. of Max. Sec. Unit (Warden),	)	(D.C. No. 77-K-1093)
Defendants-Appellants.	)	

PREVIOUS PAGE WAS BLANK

This cause came on to be heard on the record on appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

Upon consideration whereof, it is ordered that the judgment of that court is affirmed in part and set aside in part; that court's remedial order is vacated in part. The cause is remanded to the United States District Court for the District of Colorado for further proceedings all in accord with the opinion of this Court.

HOWARD K. PHILLIPS, Clerk

ORDER DENYING THE PARTIES' PETITIONS FOR REHEARING DATED NOVEMBER 10, 1980

SEPTEMBER TERM - November 10, 1980

Before Honorable Oliver Seth, Chief Judge, Honorable William J. Holloway, Jr., Honorable Robert H. McWilliams, Honorable James E. Barrett, Honorable William E. Doyle, Honorable Monroe G. McKay, Honorable James K. Logan, and Honorable Stephanie K. Seymour, Circuit Judges.

FIDEL RAMOS, DAVID LEE ANDERSON, SADIKI LISIMBA AJAMU (a/k/a Eugene Collins), ALEXANDER ROSES, MARK J. MENCHETTI and LESTER LAZENBY, et. al.,	)	
Plaintiffs-Appellees,	)	
vs.	)	No. 79-2324
THE HONORABLE RICHARD D. LAMM, Governor of the State of Colorado; JAMES G. RICKETTS, Executive Director of the Dept. of Corrections; JOHN PERKO, Director of Div. of Adult Services of Colo. Dept. of Corrections; EDGAR FOX, Dir. of Div. of Correctional Industries of Colo. Dept. of Corrections and WILLIAM WILSON, Supt. of Max. Sec. Unit (Warden),	)	
Defendants-Appellants.	)	

ORDER ON REHEARING

The court has for consideration a petition for rehearing with a suggestion for a rehearing en banc of the plaintiffs-

PREVIOUS PAGE WAS BLANK

appellees, a petition for rehearing of the defendants-appellants, a motion of defendants-appellants to supplement the record with an objection thereto, a motion of plaintiffs-appellees to issue the mandate forthwith and an objection thereto, and a bill of costs of plaintiffs-appellees and an objection thereto. The hearing panel, Judges Holloway, Barrett and Logan, ordered responses to the petition for rehearing en banc of plaintiffs-appellees and to the petition for rehearing of the defendants-appellants, which responses are not also before the court.

Turning first to the petition for rehearing of the defendants-appellants and the response thereto, the panel finds that only one matter calls for any discussion. The defendants-appellants have strenuously objected to the court's opinion which cited numerous stipulations as support for findings and conclusions of the trial court, contending that these stipulations were not actually made by the State and admitted in evidence. Without deciding whether the stipulations were approved and in evidence, the panel is convinced that in any event the whole of the evidence, exclusive of the stipulations, amply supports all the findings and conclusions of the trial court generally, as well as with respect to the mental and physical health of the inmates which is the particular area where the state mainly concentrated its objections concerning the stipulations. Accordingly, the panel is revising the opinion so that it now demonstrates that the findings and conclusions are amply supported, without any reference to the stipulations. To accomplish this the panel is ordering the filing of substitute pages within our opinion.[1] With such modification, the petition for rehearing of the defendants-appellants is denied by the panel, the remainder of the contentions therein having also been considered and having been found to lack merit.

The panel has also considered the motion to supplement the record and the motion that the mandate issue forthwith, and said motions are denied. The mandate shall issue in the regular time provided by Rule 41(a), F.R.A.P.

---

[1] We are directing the Clerk of the court hereby to file substitute pages 29 and 42 through 51 to our earlier opinion filed September 25, 1980.

With respect to the bill of costs, it is ordered by the majority of the panel that the plaintiffs-appellees be awarded 75% of the costs borne by the plaintiffs-appellees for their briefs and reproduction of the appendix, for which the clerk of this court is directed to make an entry in the mandate. Judge Barrett would require that the costs should be shared equally by the parties.

It is further ordered by the panel that the petition for rehearing of the plaintiffs-appellees is denied. The petition of the plaintiffs-appellees for rehearing being thus denied by the panel to whom the case was argued and submitted, and no member of the panel nor judge in regular active service on the court having requested that the court be polled on rehearing en banc, Rule 35, F.R.A.P., the suggestion of the plaintiffs-appellees for rehearing en banc is denied.

HOWARD K. PHILLIPS, Clerk

DEFENDANTS' EXHIBIT 1137, MEMORANDUM FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL STAFF TO SENATOR RALPH COLE DATED AUGUST 23, 1979, RE: CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS CONCERNING THE CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AT THE VARIOUS CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES (WITHOUT ATTACHMENTS)

PREVIOUS PAGE WAS BLANK

MEMORANDUM

August 23, 1979

TO: Senator Ralph Cole

FROM: Legislative Council Staff

SUBJECT: Chronology of Events Concerning the Construction Projects at the Various Correctional Facilities

From the 1976 legislative session to the present date, the General Assembly has appropriated approximately *$22,500,000* to the Department of Corrections for renovation projects, planning, and construction of new facilities. A breakdown of these items follows:

1976	House Bill 1266	$ 989,610	- renovation and construction at correctional facilities
		671,127	- construction of new minimum facilities at Rifle and Camp George West
Special Session (1976)	House Bill 1002	933,883	- renovation and construction at correctional facilities
	House Bill 1003	200,000	- planning
1977	Senate Bill 587	7,920,892	- planning and construction
1978	House Bill 1246	126,001	- construction at Rifle
	House Bill 1130	11,486,000	- construction of new maximum
1979	Senate Bill 505	115,941	- construction at Rifle
	TOTAL	$22,443,454	

PREVIOUS PAGE WAS BLANK

As explained later in this memo, the Department of Corrections is presently planning to request approximately $5,611,829 additional funds for construction and renovation. In addition, approximately $1,029,300 may be requested to fund additional community corrections programs. If these funds are appropriated for FY 80-81, the total funds appropriated for construction and renovation since 1976 will approach *$29,000,000*.

The remainder of this memo outlines the chronology of events concerning the construction projects at the correctional facilities since 1976.

1976 SPECIAL SESSION

On August 11, 1976, Governor Lamm ordered a general lock-up of the population in Maximum Security in order to reduce the violence occurring at this facility following a series of riots and stabbings. On August 31, 1976, the Governor proposed a $20 million program to eliminate deficiencies, establish programmatic changes, and initiate capital construction programs for the correctional system. This amount included $7.4 million for a new maximum security unit to house 350 inmates, $7.4 million for a new medium security unit to house 300 inmates, $3.7 million for a new 140-bed diagnostic center in conjunction with the proposed medium security unit, $150,000 to increase the physical security capabilities of medium security in Canon City, $800,000 for new industrial/vocational education buildings, $700,000 to construct a new minimum security unit in Southwest Colorado, and $90,000 for 10 correctional security officers at medium security. (See Appendix A). A breakdown of the Governor's proposed construction projects is also attached as Appendix B.

Subsequent to this proposal, a bipartisan Task Force on the State Penitentiary, appointed by legislative leaders, requested and received from the Division of Corrections a specific delineation of those items identified as being of immediate concern and those items which could be considered

during the next regular session of the General Assembly. The September 2 report of the Division of Corrections designated 13 matters for immediate funding at a total cost in excess of $2 million. The long-term capital construction and planning items amounted to about $17.8 million. The latter items could be considered at the 1977 Session.

The Task Force established its number one priority as identifying those matters which would alleviate the crisis condition associated with the general lock-up of prisoners at the Maximum Security installation at Canon City. Six proposals were deemed by the Task Force as matters in need of immediate funding by the General Assembly:

Item	Department Estimate of Cost
1. A new locking system for individual cells within Maximum Security	$150,000
2. Repair of Windows at Medium Security	150,000
3. Staffing for Medium Security Towers	86,034
4. Nine full-time equivalent employees (F.T.E.) for supervision of increased work stations at Maximum Security	89,618
5. Paint and materials to provide for increased work stations for inmates at Maximum Security	26,000
6. Screen the south side of Cell House #7 for protective custody inmates	4,000
	$505,652

The Task Force also concluded that additional correctional officers and security personnel were necessary in order to provide adequate security when Maximum Security comes out of the general lock-up situation. The FTE figure presented to the Task Force to meet this temporary need was 30.6, at an estimated cost of $286,285. The Task Force did not have sufficient time to thoroughly evaluate the information supporting this proposal and did not make a specific recommendation on the number of additional personnel required.

In order to reduce idle time and provide more employment for inmates, the Task Force supported the Division of Corrections' proposal to re-open the "Garden Program" by November 1, 1976. The garden program would allow the employment of from 20 to 30 inmates on a year-around basis. The cost of this program, based upon 7.0 full-time equivalent employees and necessary supplies, was estimated at $130,288 (see Appendix C).

The Task Force believed that a long-range master plan should be developed and submitted for Legislative consideration by February 1, 1977. Ample money should be appropriated to the Governor's office for necessary expenditures incurred by consultants and other purposes deemed necessary by a Governor's Task Force that would include representatives from the Division of Corrections, Division of Criminal Justice, and the Office of Planning and Budgeting.

On September 14, the Governor called a special session of the General Assembly (Appendix D) which convened on September15, 1976. In addition to several bills dealing with inmate behavior, the Special Session enacted two bills which were based on the Division of Corrections and the Task Force recommendations. House Bill 1002 (attached as Appendix E) appropriated $933,833 for the purpose of ameliorating some of the immediate problems which existed at the various prison facilities and House Bill 1003 (attached as Appendix F) appropriated $200,000 for the development of a master plan for state correctional services.

The $933,833 appropriation under H.B. 1002 was broken down as follows:

Modification of 192 doors	$ 61,440
Repair of lever system	32,000
Repair and replacement of windows	154,932
Staffing medium security towers (6.25 FTE)	71,695
Supervision of Increased work stations (6.75 FTE)	85,320
Operating increased work stations	26,000
Security screen in Cell House No. 7	4,000
Personal services to develop work programs	21,966
Capital outlay for work programs	55,320
Pilot woodsmen program	25,000
Utilities	1,200
Correctional technicians at max (12.75 FTE)	161,160
Correctional officers at max (10.2 FTE)	117,006
Purchase and installation of radio communication equipment	69,444
Employment of civilian radio dispatchers (3.75 FTE)	47,400

House Bill 1003 appropriated $200,000 for the development of a master plan and required that this report be completed on or before February 1, 1977.

MASTER PLAN

The Colorado Corrections Master Plan was completed and submitted to the General Assembly on February 1, 1977. The Plan recommended the construction of a new maximum security facility (480 beds), a new medium security facility (528 beds), three new minimum security caps (96 beds each), a central reception and diagnostic center (192 beds), and four community corrections centers (36 beds each). The projected cost of the construction projects was $43,280,000. The Plan also recommended renovation projects at a cost of $2,713,000, making the total cost of the recommendations in the amount of $45,993,000. (See Appendix G).

1977 SESSION

No bill was introduced in the 1977 Session which incorporated the recommendations for construction and renovation contained in the Master Plan. However, House Bill 1712 (attached as Appendix H) was introduced and would have appropriated $22,662,801 for construction to be allocated as follows:

New maximum security unit (336 beds)	$14,514,528
New minimum security camp (120 beds)	623,807
Expand industrial training center (65 beds)	650,000
Remodel present medium security (reduce by 72 beds)	3,025,523
Convert present administration building to hospital	1,263,850
Add 30 beds to Canon City diagnostic center	1,258,500
Additional community placements (150 placements)	1,326,593

House Bill 1712 was not enacted by the General Assembly, but several of the construction items contained in the bill were amended into Senate Bill 587 which was enacted during the 1977 Session.

Senate Bill 587. Senate Bill 587 created the new Department of Corrections and appropriated $7,920,892 for planning, building, and renovation at the various correctional facilities (See Appendix I). The bulk of this appropriation was for the construction of a new cellhouse at medium security with a capacity of 141 ($2,929,500), one modular unit at medium security with a 48 bed capacity ($1,177,134), expansion of ITC capacity by 65 beds ($650,000), and a new minimum security camp ($623,807). The total appropriation was allocated as follows:

(1) Maximum Security — Remodel shower control center	$220,900

(2) Physical Planning — Phase I New Maximum Security Facility for 336 persons total staffing, exclusive of administration, not to exceed 171 FTE	537,319*

* This amount represents 75% of the estimated total physical planning costs for construction of a facility with an estimated total construction cost, excluding movable equipment, of $3,169,373.

(3) Medium Security — Canon City	
Architectural and Engineering Fees	$ 270,068
Conversion of Dormitories to increase Capacity by 104	337,500
TV Monitoring in Existing Cell Houses	81,000
One modular Unit — 48 bed Capacity	1,177,134
Relocation — Temporary Maintenance Shops	53,000
New Sick Bay Unit	319,500
Activation Spare Dining Area	20,000
New Cellhouse with Capacity of 141	2,929,500
Additional Sewage Capacity	75,000
Miscellaneous Repair	40,000
Contingencies	135,034
(4) Minimum Security	
Expansion of I.T.C. Capacity by 65 beds	650,000
Trailer Rental	50,000
Construct 120-Person Honor Camp	
Site Development	25,000
Utilities	55,700
Building	491,600
Architectural and Engineering Fees	34,338
Contingencies	17,169

(5) Reformatory	
Architectural and Engineering Fees	33,100
Convert Section of Services Area into Sick Bay	60,000
Miscellaneous Repair	169,000
Contingencies	10,600
Closed Circuit TV	12,000
Expand Dormitory Capacity by 50	90,000
(6) C.W.C.I.	
Miscellaneous Repair	10,230
Metal Storage Building	16,200

COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS

Senate Bill 587 also created a legislative review committee of six members to advise the Department in implementing the act and to provide legislative input into the corrections plan. One of the committee's concern was to review the progress being made with the various capital construction projects funded through Senate Bill 587. These projects tie into the proposed plan for construction of a new maximum security facility. Continuing review of the facilities utilization plan by the Department resulted in recommendations for change to the major construction projects set forth in Senate Bill 587. The committee reviewed these proposed changes as recommended by the Department and endorsed the proposals since they were within the total dollar appropriation of Senate Bill 587, brought about cost savings in the medium security construction projects, created additional bed space, provided greater security, and gave the entire correctional system more flexibility in managing the inmate population.

Senate Bill 587 called for fully utilizing existing medium security dormitories and renovating them to increase capacity by 104, while constructing a new 48-man modular unit and a 141-man cellhouse. The Department proposed to convert the dormitories to individual rooms with a total capacity of 160 (resulting in a reduction of dormitory capacity), and to construct two 192-bed cellhouses capable of being subdivided into groups of inmates. A consequence of

this proposal was that the maintenance shops would not have to be relocated and a new sick bay unit would not have to be constructed as called for in Senate Bill 587.

Some program components of the proposed new maximum security facility contemplated in Senate Bill 587 were substantially altered with the design proposal considered by the committee. The new design proposed to centralize all kitchen facilities at medium security, and the medical facilities at the administration facility in old maximum when it is vacated. That proposal impacted on the medium security construction projects.

Senate Bill 587 called for expanding the reformatory dormitory capacity by 50. The Department proposed, in addition to expanding the dorm capacity by 50, to use the 72 beds in the reformatory diagnostic units as space for inmate use. All diagnostic servies would then be located at the diagnostic unit at old maximum.

Las Animas had been selected as the site for the 100-man honor camp funded under Senate Bill 587. The Department proposed to transfer state funding of the minimum honor camp in Las Animas ($623,799) to the medium security housing projects as proposed and to build the Las Animas camp with federal funds ($335,112) which were appropriated to construct a 100-man honor camp in House Bill 1266 (1976 Session).

The 1977 Committee determined that the proposed changes should be implemented as soon as possible. However, the Committee was informed that some form of legislative approval was necessary before the funds could be released for such purposes and the proposed changes could be implemented. In an attempt to determine the form of legislative approval necessary for such action, the Committee met jointly with the Joint Budget Committee. The JBC was briefed on the proposed changes in the various projects and viewed the proposed changes favorably. However, the JBC concluded that it was without authority to approve of the proposed changes and suggested that affirmative support from both caucuses in the House and Senate was necessary

as an indication of legislative approval for the transfer of funds to the new projects.

The Committee members contacted the various caucus chairmen for the purpose of organizing caucus meetings to discuss the proposed changes and to seek affirmative support for the proposed changes. On November 1, the Senate Republican Caucus met and was briefed on the proposed changes. The caucus concluded that it did not have constitutional authority to approve the changes without the entire General Assembly being in Session. Consequently, efforts to approve of the changes prior to convening of the General Assembly in January were abandoned.

The Committee recommended a bill which would make the necessary amendments to the line item appropriations in Senate Bill 587. These amendments were necessary for the Department to implement the proposed changes in the renovation and construction projects at medium security. This recommended bill was eventually inroduced into the 1978 Session as House Bill 1129.

The funds for physical planning of a new maximum security facility for 336 inmates to be staffed by 171 FTE ($537,319 or 75% of the estimated total physical planning costs) became effective on August 1, 1977, pursuant to Senate Bill 587. The physical planning was required for construction of a facility with an est mated total construction cost, excluding movable equipment, of $13,169,373. Senate Bill 587 provided that:

> It is the intent of the general assembly in the appropriation of funds for the physical planning for construction of the new maximum security facility that said plan shall have, as its major emphasis, the maximum degree of economy and efficiency in the construction and operation of the facility insofar as such economy and efficiency is consistent with reasonable standards of security and safety. Such construction cost shall include all necessary industries space, provision for primary medical care for all male maximum and medium security inmates in the Canon City area, and all necessary site improvements and utility service.

Prior to August 1, 1977, the principal architects for the new maximum security construction project were selected (Johnson/Hopson & Partners of Denver, in association with Gruzen & Partners of New York). At the Committee's first meeting in July, 1977, the architects presented a task flow schedule to be followed in the planning process so that proposals and recommendations could be completed by January, 1978, in time for convening of the General Assembly. The preliminary plans which were being developed by the architects were abandoned in mid-August after being reviewed by Dr. Ault and his staff. The design of the facility underwent extensive revision at the suggestion of Dr. Ault. The revision of preliminary plans and the schematic design of the new proposed facility were submitted to the Committee at its October meeting.

Some program components of the new maximum security facility contemplated in Senate Bill 587 were substantially altered with the design proposal developed by the Department. For example, Senate Bill 587 provides that the construction cost "...shall include... provision for primary medical care for all male maximum and medium security inmates in the Canon City area, ...". The design developed by the Department made no provision for a primary medical care unit in the new maximum security facility. The overall facilities utilization plan proposed that portions of the present administration building at maximum security be converted to a prison hospital and that the present hospital at maximum be renovated after the new maximum facility is completed to provide primary care for all inmates. The concern was that transporting medium and minimum security inmates into a maximum facility for health care would present security problems. In addition, by eliminating the square footage required for such a facility at the new maximum facility, the overall construction cost of the facility would be reduced.

The renovation of the administration building at old maximum to a hospital will be delayed because: 1) the present facility is necessary for continuing operation of the present maximum security until late 1980; 2) the entire medical system is being reexamined with hopes that it can be tied directly to other state systems such as the C.U.

Medical Center; 3) eighteen months can allow a great deal of change to the system base especially if new legislation is passed; and 4) legislative approval is necessary for appropriation of the funds for renovation regardless of the time frame.

The new design proposed to centralize all kitchen faciliies at medium facilities, thus eliminating the need for kitchen faciliies at the new maximum facility. It was thought that this would reduce the square footage in a high cost maximum unit, will remove potentially dangerous kitchen knives and utensils from a maximum security unit, would reduce staffing costs, and would release maximum security beds normally used for support cadre to be used for maximum inmates.

The new design was based on the architectural concept of a maximum security facility as set forth in the 1977 Corrections Master Plan (see p. 4.49, Vol. I). The basic unit consists of eight rooms. These rooms form a cluster of 48 individual rooms. Several of these 48 room clusters may be tied together to make up a wide variety of configurations dependent on the particular site topography. Each unit is self-contained and has its own security control point, regulating entrance into and out of the 48 room cluster.

The advantages of this design are that it is possible to gain strong security supervision and allows adaptability where necessary. The 48 room cluster is organized along an internal court. The 48 room clusters are broken down, in turn, into three 16 room living units, each with its own day room, which are in turn reduced to two eight room areas. The two units of eight rooms are arranged on two levels, and each level may have a community toilet-shower area or separate in-the-room toilets and showers depending on the security necessary in the units.

The design facilitates the division of the institution into manageable subdivisions of 48, either for reasons of instant separation to increase security or for reasons of major population reassignment. This flexibility is possible because each segment has a substantial portion of its own support facilities.

The 1977 Committee was involved in the discussions concerning the basic design of the facility, the site selection criteria developed for selecting the site of the proposed facility, and efforts to determine if the necessary energy/utility requirements for the proposed facility were available in the area of the site. The committee attempted to review each facet of the planning process as it was developed. The design documents were reviewed by the appropriate review agencies (State Buildings Division, Department of Health, etc.), and the proposed design was completed in January, 1978, for consideration by the General Assembly. The committee found that every effort was made to design a simple, functional and economical facility which could be operated with the least number of FTE. The maximum degree of economy and efficiency in the construction and operation of the facility was considered insofar as such economy and efficiency was consistent with reasonable standards of security and safety.

Based on the above findings, the Committee recommended a bill which would appropriate $11,486,000 for construction of the new maximum security facility as proposed by the Department. This recommended bill was introduced as House Bill 1130 in the 1978 Session.

1978 SESSION

The General Assembly enacted both House Bill 1129 and House Bill 1130 during the 1978 Session (House Bill 1129 attached as Appendix J and House Bil1 1130 attached as Appendix K).

House Bill 1129 made the following line item changes to the appropriation portion of Senate Bill 587 to implement the revised construction plan as proposed by the Department and endorsed by the Committee:

(1) Maximum Security — Remodel Shower	~~$220,900~~
Control center	$105,900

(2) Physical Planning — Phase I $ 537,319*
New Maximum Security Facility for 336 persons total staffing, exclusive of administration, not to exceed 171.0 FTE

*This amount represents 75% of the estimated total physical planning costs for construction of a facility with an estimated total construction cost, excluding movable equipment, of $13,169,373.

(3) Medium Security — Canon City ~~270,968~~
Agricultural and Engineering Fees 326,934

Conversion of Dormitories to ~~increase Capacity by 104~~ SINGLE CELLS ~~337,500~~ 500,000

TV Monitoring in Existing Cellhouses ~~81,000~~ 72,900

~~One modular Unit 48 bed capacity~~ ~~1,177,134~~

~~Relocation Temporary Maintenance Shops~~ ~~53,000~~

~~New Sick Bay Unit~~ ~~319,500~~

~~Activation of Spare Dining Area~~ ~~20,000~~

~~New Cellhouse with Capacity of 141~~ ~~2,929,500~~

Additional Sewage Capacity ~~75,000~~ 67,500

Miscellaneous Repair ~~40,000~~ 36,000

Contingencies ~~135,034~~ 152,203

TWO NEW 192-BED CELLHOUSES 4,413,041

(4) Minimum Security Expansion of I.T.C. ~~650,000~~
Capacity by 65 beds 587,100

~~Trailer Rental~~	~~$ 50,000~~
~~Construction 120-Person Honor Camp Site Development~~	~~25,000~~
~~Utilities~~	~~55,700~~
~~Building~~	~~491,600~~
~~Architectural and Engineering Fees~~	~~34,333~~
~~Contingencies~~	~~17,169~~
(5) Reformatory Architectural and Engineering Fees	~~33,100~~ 26,500
~~Convert Section of Services Area into Sick Bay~~	~~60,000~~
~~Miscellaneous Repair~~	~~169,000~~
Contingencies	10,600
~~Closed Circuit TV~~	~~12,000~~
~~Expand Dormitory Capacity by 50~~	~~90,000~~
CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS	297,900
(6) C.W.C.I.	
Miscellaneous Repair	10,230
Metal Storage Building	16,200
(7) PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION	346,465
(8) OWNERS RESERVE	299,100

The total appropriation under Senate Bill 587 was changed by House Bill 1129 from $7,920,892 to $7,805,892.

House Bill 1130 appropriated $11,486,000 to the Department of Corrections for the construction of a new maximum security facility. This appropriation is intended to include remaining A/E fees, construction, project management costs, and contingencies necessary for construction of this facility. The act provides that the facility shall house 336 persons and the total staff of the facility, exclusive of administration, shall not exceed 171.0 FTE. Senate Bill 587 provided that the estimated total construction costs, excluding movable equipment, should be $13,169,373.

REMAINING QUESTIONS

The question has been raised as to whether funds for: (1) renovation of the old maximum administration building into an infirmary, and (2) remodeling of the medium security kitchen and the purchase of food service equipment, were included in the $11,486,000 appropriation under House Bill 1130. The staff has reviewed various materials and concluded that such funds were not included in the appropriation for the construction of the new maximum facility. The progress report of the Department of Corrections to the interim Committee on November, 1977, specifically states that funds for remodeling the administration building at old maximum to provide a hospital are not funded, except for the physical planning. The estimated cost of the project is $1,656,000. The report also states that construction funds for renovation of the medium security kitchen are not available. Only design funds were to be included in the Senate Bill 587 appropriation (See Appendix L). In addition, the Department prepared comparison of Senate Bill 587 and the Department proposal included in Corrections Committee Report to the General Assembly at pages 42 through 45 indicate that funds for remodeling the administration building into a hospital and renovating the medium kitchen would have to be appropriated in the future (See Appendix M). Furthermore, Mr. Jacques Brownson, at the July 19, 1979, interim committee meeting, stated that construction funds for the infirmary have not been appropriated and that FY 80-81 funds would be necessary to complete the project, and that additional money would be necessary to complete the food service plan.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS REQUESTED

For FY 80-81, the Department will be requesting approximately $5,611,829 for completion of the construction projects and other renovation expenses. Of this amount, $1,620,000 will be for remodeling the administration building into a hospital and $2,649,611 will be for renovation of medium kitchen, food service equipment, and laundry equipment. This request for additional funds will be examined by the interim Committee on Corrections at future meetings.

No. 80-1340

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

The Honorable RICHARD D. LAMM, Governor of the State of Colorado, et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

FIDEL RAMOS, et. al.,

Respondent.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PEGGY A. WIESENBERG
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law of the Boston Bar Association
294 Washington Street
Boston, MA 02108

JAMES E. HARTLEY
HUGH Q. GOTTSCHALK
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Colorado
P.O. Box 8749
Denver, Colorado 80201

ALVIN J. BRONSTEIN
Counsel of Record
RALPH I. KNOWLES
National Prison Project of the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation, Inc.
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1031
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/331-0500

Counsel for Respondents

THE CASILLAS PRESS, INC - 1717 K Street N.W. - Washington D.C. - 223-1220

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the federal district court abused its discretion in refusing to abstain in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 challenging conditions of confinement in a state prison where none of the established doctrines of abstention applied.

2. Whether this Court should disturb the Court of Appeal's findings and conclusions that conditions of confinement at Colorado's maximum security prison violated the Eighth Amendment where the trial court and the appellate court found that conditions fell below every Eighth Amendment standard enunciated by this Court.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Case: Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 1

REASONS WHY CERTIORARI SHOULD BE DENIED

A. There Was No Basis for the Lower Courts to Abstain 8

B. The Lower Courts Used the Proper Eighth Amendment Standards and Resolution of the Question Presented by the Petition Will Make No Difference to the Outcome of the Case 14

CONCLUSION 19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:

Battle v. Anderson, 564 F.2d 388 (10th Cir. 1977) 14, 15, 16, 18

Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520 (1979) 15

Burford v. Sun Oil Co., 319 U.S. 315 (1943) 12

Campbell v. McGruder, 580 F.2d 521 (D.C. Cir. 1978) 14

Clutchette v. Procunier, 497 F.2d 809 (9th Cir. 1974), *mod. on other grounds on reh.*, 510 F.2d 613 (9th Cir. 1975), *rev'd on other grounds sub. nom. Enomoto v. Clutchette*, 425 U.S. 308 (1976) 14

Cohen v. Virginia, 19 U.S. 264 (1821) 12

Coker v. Georgia, 433 U.S. 584 (1977) 15

Colorado Water Conservation District v. United States, 424 U.S. 800 (1976) 11

PREVIOUS PAGE WAS BLANK

Page

Cruz v. Beto, 405 U.S. 319 (1972) 13

Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97 (1976) 3, 15, 16, 17

Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153 (1976) 15, 16, 17

Houghton v. Shaeffer, 392 U.S. 639 (1968) 14

Hutto v. Finney, 437 U.S .678 (1978) 15

Jones v. Diamond, _____F.2d_____, No. 78-1289 (5th Cir., Jan 29, 1981) (*en banc*) 18

Jones v. Metzger, 456 F.2d 854 (6th Cir. 1972) 14

Juidice v. Vail, 430 U.S. 327 (1977) 12

McNeese v. Board of Education, 373 U.S. 768 (1963) 13

McRedmond v. Wilson, 533 F.2d 757 (2d Cir. 1976) 14

Miller v. Carson, 563 F.2d 741 (5th Cir. 1977) 18

Monroe v. Pape, 365 U.S. 167 (1961) 13, 14

Moore v. Sims, 442 U.S. 415 (1979) 12

Newman v. Alabama, 559 F.2d 283 (5th Cir. 1977), *cert. denied* 438 U.S 918 (1978) 18

Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475 (1973) 10, 11, 14

Procunier v. Martinez, 416 U.S 396 (1974) 11, 13

Railroad Comm'n. v. Pullman Co., 312 U.S. 496 (1941) 11

Ramos v. Lamm, 485 F.Supp. 122 (D. Colo., 1979) 8, 12

Smith v. Sullivan, 611 F.2d 1039 (5th Cir. 1980) 18

Standard Oil of California v. United States, 429 U.S. 17 (1976) ... 18

Stapleton v. Mitchell, 60 F.Supp. 51 (D. Kan. 1945) 13

Page

Taylor v. Sterrett, 499 F.2d 367 (5th Cir. 1974), *cert. denied*, 420 U.S. 983 (1975) 14

Trop v. Dulles, 356 U.S. 86 (1958) 15

Weems v. United States, 217 U.S. 349 (1910) 15

Wilwording v. Swenson, 404 U.S. 249 (1971) 10

Wright v. McMann, 387 F.2d 519 (2d Cir. 1967) 14

Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37 (1971) 12

Zwickler v. Koota, 389 U.S. 241 (1967) 13

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS:

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Eighth Amendment 11, 14, 15, 17

STATUTES

28 USC 2111 17

28 USC 2254(b) 10

42 USC 1983 11

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

No. 80-1340

The Honorable RICHARD D. LAMM, Governor of the State of Colorado, et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

FIDEL RAMOS, et. al.,

Respondent.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case involves findings and conclusions by the trial court, affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, that the totality of conditions under which prisoners at Colorado's maximum security prison ("Old Max") were housed constituted cruel and unusual punishment by all known tests enunciated by this Court. (A. 11-13; A. 100-101)[1]

---

[1] All references designated A. _____ are to petitioner's Appendix to this Petition.

Petitioners continuously misrepresent the facts in the record and rely on non-record assertions about post-trial developments which the Court of Appeals agreed have no bearing on the questions presented in this Petition. On page 2 of their Petition, state officials assert that more than a year after the District Court issued its opinion in this case, the state opened 2 new prisons; petitioners fail to state how many prisoners at Old Max will be moved when the new facilities become fully operational. There is no record before this Court on this issue. Contrary to any inferences which might be drawn from the Petition, respondents are compelled to state that, based on information provided by petitioners to the District Court in the proceedings on remand, current operative plans are that a substantial number of the approximately 1000 class members will remain in Old Max after both the new maximum security prison and the new close security prison are filled to capacity.

Contrary to petitioners' assertion on page 5 of the Petition, the record is clear that the state never decided to "replace Old Max." The Executive Director of the Department of Corrections testified at trial that based on the number of prisoners at Old Max, the projected increases in prisoner population, and the reduced capacity of the new prisons, he was not willing to say that prisoners would not be confined in Old Max. (Ault. R.Vol. 30 p. 117, 155; Pl. Exh. 1 p. VII-3; See generally A. 127) The fact is that the state never intended to replace Old Max, has not replaced Old Max, and is housing prisoners at Old Max at the present time.

The Court of Appeals found that evidence of the state's plans to construct a new prison at a future date did not constitute a defense to demonstrated present constitutional violations which the appellate court found to be substan-

tial. (A. 15 n. 11; A. 125-128) Moreover, in light of conflicting reports outside the record about post-trial developments, the Court of Appeals remanded the case to the district court to hold further proceedings to determine the status of the state's plans and what actions are required to eradicate constitutional violations. (A. 47-48)

The Court of Appeals issued its ruling on September 25, 1980. The Court of Appeals denied both parties' petitions for rehearing on November 10, 1980. (A. 139) State officials applied to the Court of Appeals for a stay; their application was denied on December 2, 1980. The State's petition to recall the mandate and reinstate the stay previously issued by the Court of Appeals pending expedited appeal was denied by Mr. Justice White on December 9, 1980.

This petition is before this Court on the record of constitutional violations which were upheld by the Court of Appeals. The appellate court concluded that the district court applied a proper standard in making its findings that state officials failed to provide prisoners with minimally adequate shelter, sanitation, food, safety and medical care. (A. 12 n. 7, 13) Taking each of those areas separately, and analyzing each area independently and apart from the totality of the conditions of confinement, the appellate court concluded that the findings were entirely supported by the record and that conditions in each area were constitutionally impermissible.

1. DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE TO SERIOUS MEDICAL NEEDS

Applying the standard announced by this Court in *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976), the Court of Appeals concluded that the State has been aware of continuing grave and systematic deficiencies in the medical care

delivery system for years, yet conditions continue to "endanger [prisoners'] health and well-being, make unnecessary suffering inevitable, and evince on the part of the State a deliberate indifference to serious health needs of the prisoner population." (A. 26-34)

On-site primary care physician coverage was found to be "grossly inadequate" causing unqualified and improperly supervised staff to misdiagnose or improperly treat inmates' medical problems resulting in life threatening situations and needless pain and suffering. (A. 29-30) A lack of staff and resources caused prisoners to go without needed medical and dental care which was not available at the infirmary. (A. 30-32)

Petitioners misrepresent the testimony of Former Executive Director of Corrections Allen Ault. (Petition p. 3) Dr. Ault testified that the legislature repeatedly refused to fund critically needed mental and physical health services which he requested. (Ault R. V. 30, pp. 82, 127) The record is uncontradicted that the legislature did not include funds for correcting known deficiencies in the medical care system in the appropriation for the new maximum security prison. (A. 160).

Critical deficiencies in the mental health staffing and resources have been brought to the attention of state officials for years and have been disregarded. (A. 84) Psychiatric services had been virtually cut out because of lack of funding, even though all the experts agreed that full-time psychiatric coverage was needed to provide a minimally adequate mental health program. (A. 33)

The mental health service at Old Max was found to be totally incapable of providing mental health care to even those prisoners identified as having severe, chronic or acute disorders. (A. 33) The lack of adequate mental

health services was found to contribute to inmate suffering and cause suicide and self-mutilation by inmates. (A. 33) Between January, 1978 and May, 1979, over 91 incidents of suicide and self-mutilation were reported. (A. 83)

2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE SAFETY

The appellate court found that since the record supports the finding that the state has been "deliberately indifferent" to the legitimate safety needs of inmates at Old Max, it was not necessary for the court to reach the issue of whether a less rigorous standards of proof is applicable in totality of conditions cases. (A. 26 n. 20)

The prison population is plagued with violence and fear of violence with efforts of many prisoners being directed at merely staying alive. (A. 22-25) Petitioners' logs indicate an unacceptable number of stabbings, assaults, fights and threats. (A. 24; A. 77) Even prisoners in protective custody are routinely threatened and attacked. (A. 24) The state's own reports have highlighted petitioners' failure to maintain adequate staffing to provide prisoners with a reasonably safe environment; despite these reports, staffing was actually cut back in fiscal year 1978-1979 evidencing a "deliberate indifference" to the legitimate safety needs of prisoners.[2] (A. 25-26) (See also Ault, R. Vol. 30 pp. 131, 139)

---

[2]The District Court found that there was no showing that present or proposed facilities are adequately staffed. (A. 127) Because petitioners have raised post-trial developments which they claim will remedy deficiencies found by the district court in the area of personal safety, Petition p. 12, respondents are compelled to inform the Court that the Colorado legislature recently denied petitioners' request for supplemental appropriations for correctional officers which the Department of Corrections deemed essential for providing protection to prisoners housed at Old Max, New Max and New Close.

3. LACK OF BASIC SHELTER

As the state recognized four years earlier and concedes in this Petition, the District Court found that "[w]ith the exception of the new administration building, the [Old Max] prison is antiquated and shows the scars left by generations of neglect, the legacy of our society's past indifference to the fate of its prisoners." (Petition p. 2; A. 62)

Recognizing that a state must provide a prisoner with reasonably adequate ventilation, sanitation, bedding, hygienic materials and utilities ". . . [i]n short, . . . shelter which does not cause [an inmate needless] degeneration or threaten his mental and physical well-being" (A. 16), the Court of Appeals sustained the district court's findings that conditions in which inmates are confined at Old Max are "grossly inadequate and constitutionally impermissible." (A.19) Cellhouses are in a serious state of disrepair and are characterized by leaking roofs; excessive odors, heat and humidity due to inadequate ventilation and temperature controls; leaking pipes, defective plumbing and accumulations of raw sewage; extensive rodent and insect infestation, trash, decayed food and other assorted litter. (A. 18-19) Many of the health and sanitation deficiencies were found to be "the result of a lack of routine maintenance and cleaning programs." (A. 18) The State's inability to meet minimal shelter and sanitation standards was found to contribute immeasurably to making the main living areas "unfit for human habitation." (A. 19)

4. UNSANITARY FOOD SERVICE

Food service to prisoners was found to present an "imminent danger to their health and safety." (A. 22) The conditions in the food preparation and service area failed to meet any known public health standards. Kitchen facilities

and equipment are obsolete and unsanitary. (A. 21) The floors, walls, windows and food storage shelves throughout the area are soiled with dirt and rodent droppings. (A. 21) State health code violations continued to exist after numerous inspections. (A. 21)

The legislature deleted the plans for a food service area at New Max and then failed to appropriate funds for purchasing new kitchen equipment and expanding the food service operation at the medium security prison to handle the additional food preparation requirements for prisoners at New Max. (A. 160) No funds have been appropriated for improving food services at Old Max.

Reviewing the evidence in light of the state's obligation to provide prisoners with food which is prepared and served under conditions which do not present an immediate danger to inmate health, the Court of Appeals affirmed the district court's conclusion that conditions in the food service have a substantial and immediate detrimental impact on health and are "grossly inadequate and constitutionally impermissible." (A. 20-22)

In light of these and other findings affirmed by the Court of Appeals, petitioners statement on page 3 that "long before this lawsuit was filed, the legislative and executive branches of government were, without judicial intervention, correcting the deficiencies in the state's system of corrections" and that "prior to initiation of this suit, defendants voluntarily addressed the problems at its maximum security prison and moved forcefully and quickly to remedy those problems" is totally belied by conditions found by the Court four years later. When petitioners raised similar factual claims below, the District Court found that:

> The assertion is nothing more than gross dissimulation. The truth of the matter is that the plan [which petitioners claim they are pursuing independently of court action in this case] is a direct result of this litigation and this court's order . . . Such is not grounds for criticism of the efforts themselves but belies their "independence" and suggests the importance of this court's continued jurisdiction. *Ramos v. Lamm,* 485 F. Supp. 122, 178 (D. Colo. 1979)[3]

REASONS WHY THE WRIT SHOULD BE DENIED

A. THERE WAS NO BASIS IN FACT OR LAW FOR THE LOWER COURT TO ABSTAIN IN THIS CASE.

The facts of record do not support the formulation or the resolution of the Question Presented by the petitioners. Petitioners seek to have this Court review whether the trial court should have deferred to the "good faith" of state officials and refused to hear substantial constitutional claims of the prisoner class "given these facts:"

> This suit was filed long after the state had decided to replace its maximum security facility; after it had appropriated millions of dollars for construction of two new prisons . . .; and after it had made numerous changes in its prison programs and policies. (Petition p. 5)

The factual basis for these claims is lacking and undercuts the very basis for review.

---

[3]Although petitioners did not include this portion of the district court's reported opinion in their appendix to this Petition, it is reprinted at pp. 178-179 of the Appendix to the Petition in *Ramos v. Lamm, petition for cert. filed,* 49 U.S.L.W. 3620 (U.S. Feb. 6, 1980) (No. 80-1329).

The State has not replaced Old Max. To the extent it is relevant, the state's assertion on pages 2 and 5 of the Petition that the suit was filed long after the state appropriated money to construct two new prisons is demonstrably untrue. Prior to the filing of this action, the state made a calculated decision to direct efforts and resources to minimum and medium security institutions instead of ameliorating conditions at Old Max. (A. 127) In 1977, the year Fidel Ramos filed this action, the legislature refused to appropriate funds to build a new maximum security prison, even though the 1977 master plan recommended that a new maximum security prison be built. (A. 149-150) Although petitioners now claim on page 2 that the 1976-1977 appropriations were for a "new close" security prison, those appropriations were for renovations at the medium security prison, and the legislature did not vote to change the use of these funds until after this action was filed and certified as a class action. (A. 153-154) It was not until April, 1978 that the legislature gave its approval for using the money appropriated for renovations at the medium security prison to build a new close security prison and appropriated funds for construction of a new maximum security prison.

Moreover, petitioners misrepresent the uncontradicted testimony of Allen Ault, Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Corrections until April 30, 1979, that he was totally unsuccessful in receiving support from the Colorado Legislature except for receiving allocations to build two prisons. Among the needs refused were: adequate staffing to provide safety, let alone services, for the prisoners (some "critical" staff positions were actually cut in the 1979-1980 budget); 10% matching money for a training program for staff that could have lowered violent incidents and idleness; psychological and psychiatric services, necessary programs for the mentally retarded

prisoners; drug and alcohol abuse programs; access to adequate medical care; and qualified case managers. (See R. Vol. 30 pp. 83, 92, 93, 99, 124, 127, 130, 131, 139) In addition, Ault was even unable in 1978 to receive resources to provide critical food services and infirmary components of the two proposed new buildings.

The asserted claims are merely an attempt to relitigate petitioners "good faith" defense which was rejected on two occasions by the courts below. Although such factual claims can be taken into account in consideration of the nature and scope of the remedy to be entered by the trial court and the amount of deference which may be accorded to state officials in the remedial stage of a case, they are not relevant to the question of abstention in a case like this where substantial constitutional violations are alleged. (A. 8, 15 n. 11, 46-47, 60, 126-129) Assuming arguendo that the state were making efforts to remedy violations of law, that has never been accepted as grounds for abstention.

The two cases relied on by petitioners for reversal do not support the state's abstention argument. The first is *Preiser* v. *Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475 (1973), which stands for the simple proposition that if state prisoners request relief for constitutional violations which challenge the very fact or duration of imprisonment, then relief must be sought under the federal habeas corpus statute through which Congress has explicitly required the exhaustion of state remedies before a federal forum can be used. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b). The *dicta* regarding comity cited from *Preiser* at page 7 of the Petition was not important to the decision and is of no benefit to the state since this Court reiterated its holding in *Wilwording* v. *Swenson*, 404 U.S. 249, 251 (1971), that complaints of state prisoners relating

to the conditions of confinement properly brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 are not subject to the exhaustion of state remedies. *Preiser* v. *Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. at 482-499 & n. 14. Moreover, a year after *Preiser*, this Court explicitly rejected the suggestion that federal courts abstain from deciding complaints of state prisoners regarding conditions of confinement where no reasons for abstention are advanced other than comity. *Procunier* v. *Martinez*, 416 U.S. 396, 401 (1974).

The second case cited is *Colorado Water Conservation District* v. *United States*, 424 U.S. 800 (1976). The Court in that case clearly enunciated the three instances under which a federal district court has the discretion to invoke abstention as "an extraordinary and narrow exception to the duty of a District Court to adjudicate a controversy properly before it."[4]

The Court of Appeals fully considered each of those instances and correctly found that none of the established doctrines of abstention apply:

1. This is not a case where the federal constitutional issues "might be mooted or presented in a different posture by a state court determination of pertinent state law." (A.8) *See also, Railroad Comm'n* v. *Pullman Co.*, 312 U.S. 496 (1941).

2. This is not a case which presents "difficult questions of state law bearing on policy problems of substantial

[4]The Court allowed the complaint in *Colorado River Water Conservation District* to be dismissed based upon the explicit policy expressed by the McCarran Amendment (43 U.S.C. § 666) to avoid piecemeal litigation of complex water rights issues, the concurrent litigation on the same issues in state court and other factors clearly not present in this Eighth Amendment prison case. (See A. 9-10) The Court specifically held, in addition, that dismissal under the abstention doctrine was inappropriate. 424 U.S. at 817-821.

public import whose importance transcends the result in the case . . . at bar." (A.9) *See also, Burford* v. *Sun Oil Co.*, 319 U.S. 315 (1943).

3. This is not a case in which the respondents have attempted to enjoin a pending state proceeding initiated by a state against them in which they would have an opportunity to present their federal claim in a state forum. (A.10) *See also, Younger* v. *Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971); *Moore* v. *Sims*, 442 U.S. 415 (1979); *Juidice* v. *Vail*, 430 U.S. 327 (1977).

Finally, the State maintains that the District Court was required to abstain because the respondents could have filed their action in the Colorado courts or could have intervened in two state court actions filed by prisoners. (Petitioner p. 5 n. 2)[5] Yet the Court of Appeals correctly ruled that "the mere fact that a federal claim brought in federal court, might have been brought instead in state court does not justify abstention." (citations omitted) (A.9)

In 1821, Chief Justice Marshall, in *Cohen* v. *Virginia*, 19 U.S. 264, 404 (1821) stated: "We have no more right to decline the exercise of jurisdiction which is given, than to usurp that which is not given." Since then, this Court has consistently reaffirmed that principle and has refused to allow the right to litigate federal constitutional claims in federal court to be defeated by relegation to the state

---

[5]One of the state court cases cited was an individual claim filed after the proceedings in this case had commenced and sought totally different relief. The other case only challenged certain practices and conditions in administrative segregation and was not certified as a class action. Neither case involved the named plaintiffs in this case. *Ramos* v. *Lamm*, 485 F. Supp. at 173. (This portion of the district court's opinion is reprinted at pp. 166-167 of the Appendix to the Petition in *Ramos* v. *Lamm*, No. 80-1329. See n. 3 supra.)

courts. *See, e.g., Zwickler* v. *Koota*, 389 U.S. 241 (1967); *McNeese* v. *Board of Education*, 373 U.S. 768 (1963).

Nothing has been shown by petitioners to warrant reexamination of that principle. There is nothing novel about the exercise of federal jurisdiction in totality of conditions cases. Totality of conditions cases are no different from other cases where substantial violations of constitutional rights are alleged — the question for the court is the protection of constitutional rights and not as petitioners suggest whether the government needs prodding. (See Petition p. 8)

The duty of the federal courts to protect rights granted by the Constitution of the United States was aptly summarized by Judge Alfred Murrah as follows:

> We yet like to believe that wherever the Federal courts sit, human rights under the Federal Constitution are always a proper subject for adjudication, and that we have not the right to decline the exercise of that jurisdiction simply because the rights asserted may be adjudicated in some other forum.

Stapleton v. *Mitchell*, 60 F.Supp. 51, 55 (D. Kan. 1945), quoted with approval by the Supreme Court in *Zwickler* v. *Koota*, 389 U.S. at 248, and *McNeese* v. *Board of Education*, 373 U.S. at 674 n. 6. *See also, Procunier* v. *Martinez*, 416 U.S. 396, 405-6; *Cruz* v. *Beto*, 405 U.S. 319 (1972).

The principle was directly applied to Civil Rights Act cases such as this one in *Monroe* v. *Pape*, 365 U.S. 167, 183 (1961):

> It is well settled, of course, that if the actions of (state officials) result in a deprivation of a federally protected right, the existence of an ade-

> quate state remedy does not bar recovery under 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983. The "federal remedy is supplemental to the state remedy, and the latter need not first be sought and refused before the federal one is invoked."

Monroe v. *Pape*, 365 U.S. at 183. *See also, Wilwording* v. *Swenson*, 404 U.S. 249 (1971); *Prieser* v. *Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475 (1973); *Houghton* v. *Shaeffer*, 392 U.S. 639 (1968)[6].

The complete reversal of these principles which petitioners are requesting would be tantamount to the withdrawal of the federal forum in civil rights cases. Such a result at this date in light of the historical importance of federal civil rights litigation to our country is unthinkable.

B. RESOLUTION OF THE QUESTION PRESENTED WILL MAKE NO DIFFERENCE TO THE OUTCOME OF THIS CASE.

Both courts below found that conditions of confinement in this case violate all of the Eighth Amendment

---

[6]The Courts of Appeal have followed this Court in cases concerning the civil rights of prison inmates. *See, e.g., Campbell* v. *McGruder*, 580 F.2d 521, 525-526 (D.C. Cir. 1978); *Battle* v. *Anderson*, 564 F.2d 388, 392-393 (10th Cir. 1977); *McRedmond* v. *Wilson*, 533 F.2d 757, 760-764 (2d Cir. 1977); *Taylor* v. *Sterrett*, 499 F.2d 367, 368 (5th Cir. 1974), *cert. denied*, 420 U.S. 983 (1975); *Clutchette* v. *Procunier*, 497 F.2d 809, 814 (9th Cir. 1974), *mod. on other grounds on reh.*, 510 F.2d 613 (9th Cir. 1975), *rev'd on other grounds sub. nom. Enomoto* v. *Clutchette*, 425 U.S. 308 (1976); *Jones* v. *Metzger*, 456 F.2d 854, 856 (6th Cir. 1972); *Wright* v. *McMann*, 387 F.2d 519, 525 (2d Cir. 1967).

standards previously enunciated by this Court.[7] (A. 12-13, A. 99-100)

The State asks the Court to grant certiorari to determine the proper test to be used in ascertaining whether the Eighth Amendment is violated in prison cases. It states that this is a question of first impression and is a "logical sequel to *Bell* v. *Wolfish,*" 441 U.S. 520 (1979), in which this Court for the first time addressed the due process standard to be applied to pre-trial detainees. But as the Court explicitly stated in *Bell,* challenges to conditions and practices of confinement in prison for convicted offenders have been determined by the Court in several recent cases, including *Hutto* v. *Finney,* 437 U.S. 678 (1978), which is directly on point with this case. No issue of first impression is presented.

Petitioners attack as error some language from *Battle* v. *Anderson,* 564 F.2d 388 (10th Cir. 1977), utilized by the district court in one portion of its opinion. That language is as follows:

> While there is no constitutional right to rehabilitation, the law of this circuit is clear that the Eighth Amendment protects an inmate "from an environment where degeneration is probable

[7]Conditions which shock the conscience. *Trop* v. *Dulles,* 356 U.S. 86 (1958); *Weems* v. *United States,* 217 U.S. 349 (1910); conditions which are incompatible with evolving standards of human decency, *Hutto* v. *Finney,* 437 U.S. 678 (1978); *Trop* v. *Dulles;* conditions which involve "unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain" or the "gratuituous infliction of [mental or physical] suffering," *Coker* v. *Georgia,* 433 U.S. 584 (1977); *Estelle* v. *Gamble,* 429 U.S. 97 (1976); *Gregg* v. *Georgia,* 428 U.S. 153 (1976); conditions which constitute deliberate indifference to the prisoners' protected interest, *Estelle* v. *Gamble,* punishment which is grossly disproportionate to the offense. *Coker* v. *Georgia, supra, Gregg* v. *Georgia, supra; Weems* v. *United States, supra.*

> and self-improvement is unlikely *because of the conditions existing* which inflict *needless* suffering whether physical or mental." (Emphasis added)[8] (A.105)

See Battle v. *Anderson*, 564 F.2d 388, 393, 403 (10th Cir. 1977) citing *Estelle* v. *Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976) and *Gregg* v. *Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153 (1976). In affirming the portion of the district court ruling that conditions of shelter in this case were so grossly inadequate as to the shock the conscience and to be intolerable to basic fairness, the Court of Appeals referred to the quoted *Battle* language and clarified its earlier ruling as follows:

> A necessary corrollary to this ruling is that a state must provide . . . [an inmate with] reasonably adequate ventilation, sanitation, bedding, hygienic materials, and utilities (i.e., hot and cold water, light, heat, plumbing) . . . [citations omitted] . . . In short, a state must provide an inmate with shelter which does not cause his degeneration or threaten his mental and physical well-being. *Battle* v. *Anderson*, *supra*, 564 F.2d at 403. (A.16)
>
> * * *
>
> This includes providing nutritionally adequate food that is prepared and served under conditions which do not present an immediate danger to health and well-being of the inmates who consume it. (citations omitted) (A. 20)

---

[8]The State ignores the underlined words of this quote in attempting to trivialize the language in its argument that degeneration is inevitable. Petition at p. 11. Thus it is not just degeneration but needless suffering or gratuituous infliction of pain that is barred.

Petitioners claim that this test is too subjective and does not provide the state with clearly-defined constitutional criteria. Petition at p. 11.

Review of this question by certiorari is not warranted because a ruling on the alleged error will not affect the substantive rights of the parties. 28 U.S.C. § 2111. The Court of Appeals' ultimate conclusion of liability relied not upon the language cited but upon the express finding by the district court that the conditions in which these prisoners were forced to live violated every Eighth Amendment standard announced by this Court to wit:

> I find that *the conditions of confinement* at [Old Max] *meet all tests by all known measures of proof.* As shown by substantial evidence, these conditions shock the conscience, are incompatible with evolving standards of decency, involve unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain, and evidence both deliberate indifference to the prisoners' protected interests and "circumstances and conduct so grossly incompetent, inadequate or excessive as . . . to be intolerable to basic fairness." (Emphasis added) (A. 12 n. 7; A. 100-101 n. 20)

The State does not now challenge the underlying factual findings upon which the district court relied to reach the conclusion that all Eighth Amendment standards were violated. Therefore, even though the challenged language is valid and simply restates the ban of this Court against a *gratuitous* infliction of mental or physical suffering, *See, e.g., Estelle* v. *Gamble,* 429 U.S. 153 (1976) and *Gregg* v. *Georgia,* 428 U.S. 153 (1976), the reference to it by the district court is not determinative to the opinion of the Tenth Circuit or its mandate.

Because the Court of Appeals only relied upon standards previously adopted by this Court, any attempt by the State to create a conflict between the Tenth Circuit opinion in this case and the opinion of the Fifth Circuit in *Newman* v. *Alabama*, 559 F.2d 283, 291 (5th Cir. 1977), *cert. denied* 438 U.S. 918 (1978) is irrelevant.[9] As the Court of Appeals recognized there is no conflict between the Tenth Circuit opinion in this case and the Fifth Circuit's rulings in *Newman* and subsequent totality of conditions cases (A. 13) *See, Jones* v. *Diamond* No. 78-1289 (5th Cir. Jan. 29, 1981) (en banc); *Smith* v. *Sullivan*, 611 F.2d 1039, 1044-45 (5th Cir. 1980); *Miller* v. *Carson*, 563 F.2d 741 (5th Cir. 1977). As shown above, in this case, the Tenth Circuit focused its attention on the "core areas" of food, shelter, sanitation, medical care and personal safety – the very areas that the *Newman* opinion addressed.

To the extent that the state now claims that changes have been made since the trial which will remedy deficiencies found by the district court, see Petition p. 12, the appropriate place to present evidence of those changes is in the trial court. The Court of Appeals remanded the case to the district court specifically for the development of facts on these issues. (A. 47-48) Certiorari is not warranted because an appellate mandate can only address the record and issues originally before the court and cannot deal with possible later developments. *Standard Oil Co. of California* v. *United States*, 429 U.S. 17, 18 (1976).

---

[9]Contrary to the implications of the State, the dicta of Judge Coleman in *Newman* was not addressed to the language of *Battle, supra*, at all, but was directed at an absolute statement in a brief that "states have a duty to insure that the mental, physical and emotional status of prisoners in their custody do not deteriorate." *Newman* v. *Alabama*, 559 F.2d at 291.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the Petition for Certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

PEGGY A. WIESENBERG
Lawyers' Committee for Civil
Rights Under Law of the
Boston Bar Association
294 Washington Street
Boston, MA 02108

ALVIN J. BRONSTEIN
Counsel of Record
RALPH I. KNOWLES
National Prison Project of the
American Civil Liberties Union
Foundation, Inc.
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1031
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/331-0500

JAMES E. HARTLEY
HUGH Q. GOTTSCHALK
American Civil Liberties Union
Foundation of Colorado
P.O. Box 8749
Denver, Colorado 80201

Counsel for Respondents

NO. 80-1340

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

The Honorable RICHARD D. LAMM, Governor, State of Colorado; JAMES G. RICKETTS, etc.; JOHN PERKO, etc,; EDGAR FOX, etc.; WILLIAM WILSON, etc.,

Petitioners,

v.

FIDEL RAMOS; DAVID LEE ANDERSON; SADIKI LISIMBA AJAMU, a/k/a Eugene Collins; ALEXANDER ROSES; MARK J. MENCHETTI; LESTER LASENBY,

Respondents.

BRIEF FOR AMICUS CURIAE THE STATE OF FLORIDA, JOINED AND SUPPORTED BY THE STATE OF HAWAII

TANY S. HONG
ATTORNEY GENERAL

JAMES DANNERBERG
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
State Capitol
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
808/548-4740

JIM SMITH
ATTORNEY GENERAL

MITCHELL D. FRANKS
JAMES A. PETERS
ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL
Department of Legal Affairs
The Capitol-Suite 1501
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
904/488-1573

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	I-III
INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE	1-4
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	4-5
ARGUMENT	
A. ABSTENTION	5-15
B. THE CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARD TO EVALUATE CRUEL AND UNUSUAL CONFINEMENT	15-23
CONCLUSION	23-24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	PAGE
Alabama Public Service Commission v. Southern Railway Co., 341 U.S. 341, 350 (1951)	12
Atiyeh v. Capps, A-625, 49 L.W. 3558	17, 18
Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520 (1979)	15
British Columbia Investment Co., et al v. Federal Deposit Insurance Corp., 420 F.Supp. 1217 (S.D. Cal. 1976)	7
Costello v. United States, 365 U.S. 265, 282 (1961)	10
Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 102 (1976)	16
Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238 (1972)	17, 18 19, 22
Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153, 184 (1976)	17, 18
Harrison v. NAACP, 360 U.S. 167 (1959)	13
Hartford-Empire Co. v. United States, 323 U.S. 386, 409 (1945)	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CONTINUED

CASES	PAGE
Hecht Co. v. Bowles, 321 U.S. 321, 329-330 (1944)	7
Hostetter v. Idlewild Liquor Corporation, 377 U.S. 324, 352 (1964)	6
Lathan v. Brinegar, 506 F.2d 677, 691-92 (9th Cir. 1974)	10
Louisiana Power & Light Co. v. City of Thibodaux, 360 U.S. 25, 33 (1959)	13
McElvaine v. Brush, 142 U.S. 155 (1891)	15
Moore v. Sims, 442 U.S. 415 (1979)	10, 11
Newman v. Alabama, 559 F.2d 283 (5th Cir. 1977)	3, 19
Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 491 (1973)	6, 13
Procunier v. Martinez, 416 U.S. 396 (1974)	5, 13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CONTINUED

CASES	PAGE
Rudolph v. Alabama, 375 U.S. 889 (1963)	16
Swift & Co. v. United States, 276 U.S. 311, 326 (1928)	8
Trezza v. Brush, 142 U.S. 160 (1891)	15
Trop v. Dulles, 356 U.S. 86 (1958)	16
United States v. Oregon Medical Society, 343 U.S. 326, 334 (1952)	8
Walling v. Youngerman Reynolds Hardwood Co., 325 U.S. 419, 421 (1945)	8
Weems v. United States, 217 U.S. 349 (1910)	15
Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37, 43 (1971)	6
Zwickler v. Koota, 389 U.S. 241, 254 (1967)	13

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

NO. 80-1040

The Honorable RICHARD D. LAMM, etc., et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

FIDEL RAMOS, etc., et al.

Respondents.

BRIEF FOR AMICUS CURIAE THE STATE OF FLORIDA JOINED AND SUPPORTED BY THE STATE OF HAWAII

INTEREST OF AMICI

The Attorneys General of the States of Florida and Hawaii, pursuant to Rule 36.4, Rules of the Supreme Court of the

United States, respectfully submit this brief on behalf of the States of Florida and Hawaii as Amicus Curiae, urging that this Petition for Writ of Certiorari be granted.

The State of Florida, as a sovereign maintaining an inmate population in excess of 20,000 in eighty-one state correctional institutions or prisons, and the State of Hawaii, as a state maintaining a growing inmate population, are vitally concerned with the proliferation of often duplicative inmate lawsuits to which their executive and judicial branches are exposed in the state and federal courts. The unnecessary

repetition of such duplicative suits creates an inefficient drain on state and federal judicial and executive resources which is common to many states. Appropriate recognition of judicial abstention will alleviate much of that inefficiency.

The emergence of a federal judicial "degeneration" standard by which a "totality of conditions" in a state prison is to be evaluated, particularly in cases in which abstention is equitably required, will present an ominous catalyst for a new generation of inmate "totality" suits and, at the very least, will precipitate a second standard, which will cloud the adequacy of improvements made under the existing "reasonably

adequate" standard of Newman v. Alabama, 559 F.2d 283 (5th Cir. 1977), cert. den., 438 U.S. 915 (1978).

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Because the Colorado authorities had acknowledged deficiencies at the Colorado penitentiary and had accomplished substantial commitments and improvements to resolve those deficiencies, the district court abused its discretion by failing to abstain from deciding this case. Furthermore, the standard by which the "totality of conditions" at the Colorado penitentiary were evaluated departs from the accepted and evolving standards as determined by past interpretations of the Eighth Amendment.

Because of the economic and social impact of the decisions below on the fifty states which maintain prison populations, this Petition for Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF GRANTING CERTIORARI

A. ABSTENTION

Abstention under the circumstances of this "totality of conditions" prison suit is appropriate and is consistent with previous rulings of this Court. Although discretionary, such abstention would free the federal judiciary from prolonged involvement in the myriad issues of administering the Colorado state penitentiary--issues concurrently

being addressed by the Colorado State judicial, legislative and executive branches of government--and would perpetuate and foster a more economical and responsible state solution to this state problem.

The unique and multifaceted nature of prison administration has long been recognized by this Court, the relevant holdings of which are echoed only by a disappointing whisper in the courts below. Procunier v. Martinez, 416 U.S. 396 (1974), recognizes the "Herculean obstacles" and the "complex and intractable" problems facing prisons in America, problems which are not "readily susceptible of resolution by decree," problems for which the courts are

"ill-equipped to deal." Similarly, Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 491 (1973), acknowledges the strong considerations of comity that require the federal judiciary to grant the state the first opportunity to correct its errors.

The abstention doctrine, which Petitioners sought to invoke in this cause, is founded in equity. Hostetter v. Idlewild Liquor Corporation, 377 U.S. 324, 352 (1964); Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37, 43 (1971). The equitable maxims, which accompany the doctrine, clamor for abstention in favor of the state petitioner which has, at its own initiative and prior to litigation, undertaken and accomplished substantial and tangible results to alleviate the prison problems at issue in this cause.

When a party seeks to invoke court powers in equity, the party is subject to equitable defenses. British Columbia Investment Company, et al v. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, 420 F.Supp. 1217 (S.D. Cal. 1976). The substantial equitable conduct of Petitioners, as summarized at pages 2 and 3 of their Petition for Writ of Certiorari, literally leaps from their pleadings and filings in this cause and from the related court orders.

The function of equity is not to punish, but merely to take action as the Court in its discretion deems necessary to prevent the recurrence of improper conduct. Hartford-Empire Co. v. United States, 323 U.S. 386, 409 (1945); Hecht

Co. v. Bowles, 321 U.S. 321, 329-330 (1944); Swift & Co. v. United States, 276 U.S. 311, 326 (1928). Where voluntary action has been taken in good faith to minimize such recurrence, even though under the pressure of litigation, this is a factor which the Court can and should consider in formulating relief. United States v. Oregon Medical Society, 343 U.S. 326, 334 (1952); Walling v. Youngerman Reynolds Hardwood Co., 325 U.S. 419, 421 (1945). As is conspicuously understated in Footnote 2 of the Petition for Writ of Certiorari filed with this Court, not only were the Colorado executive and legislative branches proceeding expeditiously, but Colorado state courts permitted inmates to file actions in state court pursuant

to 42 U.S.C. §1983 to remedy unconstitutional prison conditions. At the time this cause was heard on Motions to Dismiss and/or Abstain, there were at least two such pending actions concerning the penitentiary, actions in which Respondents Ramos, Anderson, et al., could have intervened. Respondents, in ignoring those existing state court actions, have prejudiced the State of Colorado Petitioners and have tainted their own standing to seek equitable aid in the federal forum.[1] See, e.g.,

---

[1] Certainly the time, effort, and expenses, including attorney fees, would be better spent on those programs already voluntarily undertaken to correct recognized problems. The state did not need nor require this diversion of its energies and resources to accomplish these constitutional tasks.

Costello v. United States, 365 U.S. 265, 282 (1961); Lathan v. Brinegar, 506 F.2d 677, 691-92 (9th Cir. 1974).

In Moore v. Sims, 442 U.S. 415 (1979), this Court applied the abstention doctrine to curtail duplicative district court action. In doing so, it allowed a pending state court proceeding to adjudicate federal constitutional questions. It observed that a consideration for such abstention was the needless obstruction to the policy of the states by forestalling state action. The federal courts disrupt the process of state reconciliary action when the courts interject themselves into local disputes. They concurrently prevent the informed evolution of state policy. If equitable

abstention is ignored in such circumstances,

> . . . [t]he price exacted in terms of comity would only be outweighed if state courts were not competent to adjudicate federal constitutional claims--a postulate we have repeatedly and emphatically rejected. (citations omitted) Moore, 442 U.S. at 430.

There was and is no finding that the Colorado state court was not competent to adjudicate the federal constitutional claim which Respondents' inmate class submitted to it in the state action paralleling this federal action.

The policy of the State of Colorado allowed an open forum in state court to resolve cases of the type presented by Respondents. The administration and policy of the State of Colorado allowed

the Petitioners to candidly acknowledge, address, and resolve the deficiencies which Respondents Ramos, et al., put here at issue. The very record by which the Petitioners documented their prison's deficiencies and documented their remedial accomplishments was presented as evidence against them.

This Court has repeatedly held that intervention of a federal court is not necessary for the protection of federal rights and that "few public interests have a higher claim upon the discretion of a federal chancellor than the avoidance of needless friction with state policies." Alabama Public Service Commission v. Southern Railway Co., 341 U.S. 341, 350 (1951). The unsettling of

the delicate balance in the area of federal state relationships has repeatedly been viewed as an appropriate reason for abstention. See concurring opinion of Justice Harlan in Zwickler v. Koota, 389 U.S. 241, 254 (1967); Louisiana Power and Light Co., v. City of Thibodaux, 360 U.S. 25, 33 (1959); Harrison v. NAACP, 360 U.S. 167, (1959). Yet the district court, by failing to abstain, has used the fruit of that good-faith state policy to condemn the state's progress and to further impair and perplex the state's capacity to resolve its prison problem.

Certainly the rationale of Presier and Procunier, supra, when coupled with

the equitable considerations discussed above, suggests that an unsettling of the federal-state relationship and responsibilities was unnecessarily provoked by the district court's refusal to abstain.

B. THE CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARD TO EVALUATE CRUEL AND UNUSUAL CONFINEMENT

The Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides:

> Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

In its early interpretations, this Court construed that Amendment to prohibit such punishments as burning at the stake, disemboweling, and quartering.

In other decisions, the Amendment has been construed to evaluate the more subtle distinctions of conditions of confinement, e.g., McElvaine v. Brush, 142 U.S. 155 (1891), and Trezza v. Brush, 142 U.S. 160 (1891), rejecting arguments that solitary confinement was, per se, unconstitutional; Weems v. United States, 217 U.S. 349 (1910), prohibiting a sentence of "cadena tempora," and most recently Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520 (1979). Indeed, the length of the Court's opinion in Bell and the multiple case citations appearing therein evidence the plethora of inmate lawsuits of the last decade and the need to sanction standards of practical application.

All cases discussing it evidence, implicitly or expressly, the fact that the requirement of the Eighth Amendment guarantee was and is a progressive and evolving one determined by the standards of decency which mark the progress of a maturing society. See, e.g., Trop v. Dulles, 356 U.S. 86 (1958); Rudolph v. Alabama, 375 U.S. 889 (1963); Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 102 (1976)2/

2/The workable standard provided in Estelle, "deliberate indifference," is far removed from the subjective "degeneration" standard applied below.

Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238 (1972).3/

As recently as February 4, 1981, Mr. Justice Rehnquist's in-chambers opinion in Atiyeh v. Capps, A-625, 49 L.W. 3558, cited Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153, 184 (1976), for the proposition that retribution is a permissible goal of incarceration.

> In short, nobody promised them a rose garden; and I know of nothing in the Eighth Amendment which requires that they be

---

3/Furman suggests three criteria for the determination. Punishment may not be so severe as to be degrading to the dignity of human beings, may not be arbitrary, and may not be so severe as to be unacceptable to contemporary society. 408 U.S. 271-274.

> housed in a manner most pleasing to them, or considered even by most knowledgeable penal authorities to be likely to avoid confrontations, psychological depression, and the like. They have been convicted of crime, and there is nothing in the constitution which forbids their being penalized as a result of that conviction.

Even given the "evolving standards" perspective noted above, the Furman, Gregg, and Atiyeh holdings, supra, contrast remarkably and clash with the "degeneration test" applied in the case at bar. The individualized "degeneration" standard requiring that an inmate is entitled to be confined in an environment which does not result in his degeneration or threatens his mental and

physical well being is so subjective,[4] restrictive, and individualized as to preclude virtually all types of punitive sentencing. "The mental, physical and emotional status of individuals, whether in or out of custody, do [sic] deteriorate and there is no power on earth to prevent it." Newman v. Alabama, 559 F.2d 283, 291 (5th Cir. 1972).

---

[4]/There exists substantial authority that in evaluating punishments under the Eighth Amendment the court "must make certain that the judicial determination is as objective as possible." Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238, 277, and note 21 thereon.

The "double bunking" sanctioned in Bell might well throw an inmate accustomed to wide-open spaces into the bowels of depression. The central and common toilet facilities common to virtually all penal institutions could cause most inmates substantial anxiety. A claustrophobic inmate under the "degeneration" standard could not be confined in a walled cell at all. A parent might degenerate if confined away from his or her offspring. Obviously, the legitimization of this standard will play havoc with the emerging "reasonably adequate standard," could encourage unrealistic determinations, and would compound the difficulties of the already complex subject of prison reform.

Review of that standard by this Court, whether to condone or condemn the standard, would timely, expeditiously, and efficiently determine the direction that this evolving standard is to take. The expenditure of virtually hundreds of millions of dollars in the fifty states maintaining prisoner populations would be immediately and beneficially affected by this Court's prompt resolution of the issues presented herein.

> The Cruel and Unusual Punishments Clause, like the other great clauses of the Constitution, is not susceptible of precise definition. Yet we know that the values and ideals it embodies are basic to our scheme of government. And we know also that the Clause imposes upon this Court the duty, when the issue is properly

> presented, to determine the constitutional validity of a challenged punishment, whatever that punishment may be. Concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Brennon in Furman, 360 U.S. at 258.

This issue is properly presented. Certiorari should be granted accordingly.

CONCLUSION

This case presents two issues which should be decided by the Court. Those issues have escaped resolution thus far. Because of the emergence of prison reform litigation based upon "totality of conditions" which is facing many states, these issues are properly before this

Court for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

TANY S. HONG
ATTORNEY GENERAL
State of Hawaii

JAMES DANNERBERG
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
Department of the Attorney General
State Capitol
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

JIM SMITH
ATTORNEY GENERAL
State of Florida

MITCHELL D. FRANKS
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

JAMES A. PETERS
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
Department of Legal Affairs
The Capitol, Suite 1501
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
904/488-1573

Case No. 80-1340

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

The Honorable RICHARD D. LAMM, Governor of the State of Colorado; JAMES G. RICKETTS, Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Corrections; JOHN PERKO, Director of Adult Services of the Colorado Department of Corrections; EDGAR FOX, Director of the Division of Correctional Industries of the Colorado Department of Corrections; and WILLIAM WILSON, Superintendent of the Canon Correctional Facility,

Petitioners,

v.

FIDEL RAMOS, DAVID LEE ANDERSON, SADIKI LISIMBA AJAMU, (a/k/a Eugene Collins), ALEXANDER ROSES, MARK J. MENCHETTI, LESTER LASENBY,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

Brief of the States of Oregon, Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, West Virginia and Wyoming and American Samoa In Support of Petition for Writ of Certiorari, Amici Curiae

DAVE FROHNMAYER
Attorney General of Oregon
JOHN R. McCULLOCH, JR.
Solicitor General
WILLIAM F. GARY
Deputy Solicitor General
JAMES E. MOUNTAIN, JR.
Assistant Attorney General
JAN PETER LONDAHL
Assistant Attorney General
100 State Office Building
Salem, Oregon 97310
Telephone: (503) 378-4402
Counsel for Amicus Curiae

03 81

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Brief

	Page
Statement of Interest	2
Argument	3
Lamm v. Ramos is a Totality of the Circumstances Case	5
Lamm v. Ramos Presents an Opportunity to Review the Broadest and Most Subjective of the Current Lower Federal Court Tests	10
Conclusion	19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases Cited

	Page
Atiyeh v. Capps, — US —— (1981, Rehnquist, J., *in chambers*) Sl Op at 3	17
Battle v. Anderson, 564 F.2d 388 (10th Cir. 1977)	2, 6, 11, 15
Battle v. Anderson, 447 F. Supp. 516 (E.D. Okla. 1977)	11, 15
Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520 (1979)	11
Capps v. Atiyeh, 495 F. Supp. 802 (D. Or. 1980)	6, 14
Chapman v. Rhodes, 434 F. Supp. 1007 (S.D. Ohio, 1977)	5, 7
Courtney v. Bishop, 409 F.2d 1185 (8th Cir. 1969)	7
Crowe v. Leeke, 540 F.2d 740 (4th Cir. 1976)	4
Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97 (1976)	14
Finney v. Arkansas Bd. of Corrections, 505 F.2d 194 (8th Cir. 1974)	7
Finney v. Hutto, 410 F. Supp. 251 (E.D. Ark. 1976), *aff'd,* 548 F.2d 743 (8th Cir. 1977), *aff'd,* 437 U.S. 678 (1978)	7
French v. Hayne, 547 F.2d 994 (7th Cir. 1976)	4, 7
Gates v. Collier, 501 F.2d 1291 (5th Cir. 1976)	4, 7
Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153 (1976)	14, 17
Hite v. Leeke, 564 F.2d 670 (4th Cir. 1977)	4, 13
Holt v. Hutto, 363 F. Supp. 194 (E.D. Ark. 1973) *aff'd in part and reversed in part sub nom Finney v. Arkansas Bd. of Corrections,* 505 F.2d 194 (8th Cir. 1974)	7
Holt v. Sarver, 300 F. Supp. 825 (E.D. Ark. 1969)	7
Holt v. Sarver, 309 F. Supp. 362 (E.D. Ark. 1970), *aff'd,* 442 F.2d 304 (8th Cir. 1971)	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

Cases Cited—Continued

	Page
Hoptowit v. Ray, — F. Supp. —— (E.D. Wash. 1980)	14
Hutto v. Finney, 437 U.S. 678 (1978)	16
Jackson v. Bishop, 268 F. Supp. 804 (E.D. Ark. 1967), *vacated,* 404 F.2d 571 (8th Cir. 1968)	6
Johnson v. Levine, 588 F.2d 1378 (4th Cir. 1978)	7
Laaman v. Helgemoe, 437 F. Supp. 269 (D.N.H. 1977)	2
Nadeau v. Helgemoe, 561 F.2d 411 (1st Cir. 1977)	4
Newman v. Alabama, 559 F.2d 283 (5th Cir. 1977), *cert denied,* 438 U.S. 915 (1978)	6, 13-15
Palmigiano v. Garrahy, 443 F. Supp. 956 (D.R.I. 1977) *remanded,* 599 F.2d 17 (1st Cir. 1979)	2
Procunier v. Martinez, 416 U.S. 396 (1973)	8, 16
Pugh v. Locke, 406 F. Supp. 318 (M.D. Ala. 1976)	2
Ramos v. Lamm, 485 F. Supp. 122 (D. Colo. 1979)	3
Rhodes v. Chapman (No. 80-322)	2-3, 4-5, 7-10
Sweet v. South Carolina Dept. of Corrections, 529 F.2d 854 (4th Cir. 1975)	7
Talley v. Stephens, 247 F. Supp. 683 (E.D. Ark. 1965)	6
Trop v. Dulles, 356 U.S. 86 (1958)	10, 15
Williams v. Edwards, 547 F.2d 1206 (5th Cir. 1977)	7
Wolfish v. Levi, 573 F.2d 118 (2d Cir. 1978), *rev'd in part on other grounds sub nom Bell v. Wolfish,* 441 U.S. 520 (1979)	13

Constitutional Provisions

US CONST., amend VIII	Passim

Other Authorities

A. Von Hirsch, et al, *Doing Justice* xix, 115 (1976)	16
Fair, *The Lower Federal Courts as Constitution-Makers: The Case of Prison Conditions,* 7 Am. J. Crim. Law 119, 124 (1979)	5
N. Morris, *The Future of Imprisonment* 12, 22, 35-36 (1974)	16
Note, Complex Enforcement, Unconstitutional Prison Conditions, 94 Harv L Rev 626, 640 (1981)	11, 12
Robbins and Buser, Punitive Conditions of Prison Confinement: An Analysis of *Pugh v. Locke* and Federal Court Supervision of State Penal Administration Under the Eighth Amendment, 29 Stan Law Review 893 (1977)	9

In the Supreme Court of the United States

Case No. 80-1340

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

The Honorable RICHARD D. LAMM, Governor of the State of Colorado; JAMES G. RICKETTS, Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Corrections; JOHN PERKO, Director of Adult Services of the Colorado Department of Corrections; EDGAR FOX, Director of the Division of Correctional Industries of the Colorado Department of Corrections; and WILLIAM WILSON, Superintendent of the Canon Correctional Facility,

Petitioners,

v.

FIDEL RAMOS, DAVID LEE ANDERSON, SADIKI LISIMBA AJAMU, (a/k/a Eugene Collins), ALEXANDER ROSES, MARK J. MENCHETTI, LESTER LASENBY,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

Brief of the States of Oregon, Alaska, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, West Virginia and Wyoming and American Samoa In Support of Petition for Writ of Certiorari, Amici Curiae

Draft 3/05/81 Docket No. 80-1340

AMICUS BRIEF

Amici respectfully pray that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment and opinion of the

United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit entered in this proceeding on September 25, 1980.

STATEMENT OF INTEREST

Amici are states which operate penal institutions as integral parts of the criminal justice system within their respective jurisdictions. In recent years, state prisoners have successfully obtained federal judicial review of a wide range of state prison conditions and correctional practices by asserting institution-wide violations of the Eighth Amendment prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment. Through their application of the Eighth Amendment, lower federal courts have become the ultimate arbiters of the adequacy of virtually every aspect of the criminal dispositional process, from classification and placement[1] to educational and rehabilitation programs.[2]. Because the federal courts are currently using a variety of tests to evaluate the constitutionality of institutional conditions, amici are unable to anticipate federal intervention and voluntarily conform their programs to constitutional standards.

This Court is presently considering the proper standard for application of the Eighth Amendment in the context of a prison overcrowding claim. *Rhodes v.*

[1] *See, eg, Palmigiano v. Garrahy*, 443 F. Supp. 956 (D.R.I. 1977) *remanded*, 599 F.2d 17 (1st Cir. 1979); *Pugh v. Locke*, 406 F. Supp. 318 (M.D. Ala. 1976).

[2] *See, e.g., Battle v. Anderson*, 564 F.2d 388 (10th Cir. 1977); *Laaman v. Helgemoe*, 437 F. Supp. 269 (D.N.H. 1977).

Chapman (No. 80-322). The broader range of the lower courts' inquiry in this case provides an appropriate vehicle for the Court to expand the scope of its consideration and to provide both the lower courts and the states with a more thorough explication of the proper Eighth Amendment standard for review of prison condition challenges.

ARGUMENT

This is a class action in which the plaintiffs proceeded on behalf of all persons confined at the maximum security unit of the Colorado State Penitentiary (Old Max). The plaintiffs challenged a wide variety of conditions of confinement and correctional practices at Old Max, primarily on the ground that they constituted cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the Eighth Amendment.[3] The District Court[4] considered the age, deterioration, and general architectural inadequacy of the physical plant, 485 F. Supp. at 133-137, (A-62-70), inmate idleness and isolation, 485 F. Supp. at 137-138, (A-70-72), inadequate employment, educational and recreational opportunities, 485 F. Supp. at 139-140, (A-72-76), poor security, medical care and inmate classification, 485 F. Supp. at 140-

[3]In addition to their Eighth Amendment claims, plaintiffs challenged policies at Old Max relating to visitation, correspondence, and access to the courts. These issues were joined and disposed of on First Amendment grounds and apparently played no role in the Court's Eighth Amendment analysis.

[4]The District Court's opinion is reported as *Ramos v. Lamm*, 485 F. Supp. 122 (D. Colo. 1979).

150, (A-76-94), and concluded that "the overall effect is to create conditions . . . that make degeneration likely and self-improvement impossible." 485 F. Supp. at 156, (A-105). On that basis, the district court held that "members of the plaintiff class have suffered denials of due process and the infliction of cruel and unusual punishment. . . ." 485 F. Supp. at 169, (A-130). To remedy this perceived across-the-board Eighth Amendment violation, the court ordered closure of Old Max.

The Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit approved the constitutional standard applied by the District Court, upheld most of its factual findings, and remanded the case "for further proceedings in light of changed conditions and this opinion." (A-48).

In many respects, this case presents the same issues now before this Court in *Rhodes v. Chapman* (80-322). As in *Rhodes,* the federal courts in this case have ordered sweeping changes in Colorado's correctional system on the basis of one of a variety of highly subjective lower federal court standards for evaluating Eighth Amendment claims in the context of class action prison condition lawsuits.[5] As in *Rhodes,* the

[5] *See, e.g. Hite v. Leeke,* 564 F.2d 670 (4th Cir. 1977) (Evolving Standards of Decency); *Nadeau v. Helgemoe,* 561 F.2d 411 (1st Cir. 1977) (Evolving Standards of Decency and Shocking to the Conscience); *Gates v. Collier,* 501 F.2d 1291 (5th Cir. 1976) (Evolving Standards of Decency and Totality of Circumstances); *French v. Hayne,* 547 F.2d 994 (7th Cir. 1976) (Shocking to the Conscience and Totality of Circumstances); *Crowe v. Leeke,* 540 F.2d 740

(Continued on following page)

courts here have ignored the historical and linguistic roots of the term "cruel and unusual punishment"[6] and, in doing so, have converted the minimum standard embodied in the Eighth Amendment into a jurisdictional base from which to impose apparently unreviewable architectural and penological standards upon the states. The exercise of this Court's jurisdiction is appropriate in this case to ensure that its ultimate disposition will be consistent with whatever constitutional guidelines are established in *Rhodes v. Chapman.* There are, however, more far reaching reasons for granting certiorari in this case. Apart from the categorical similarities between the issues in this case and those presented in *Rhodes,* there are important differences between the cases which make *Lamm v. Ramos* a logical companion case or sequel.

Lamm v. Ramos is a Totality of the Circumstances Case

In *Rhodes,* the district court found an Eighth Amendment violation based solely upon an inmate census which was 38% above the design capacity of the prison. *Chapman v. Rhodes,* 434 F. Supp. 1007 (S.D.

(Continued from previous page)

(4th Cir. 1976) (Shocking to the Conscience and Balancing Test). One commentator has identified five separate tests which are now being employed by federal district courts. Fair, *The Lower Federal Courts as Constitution-Makers: The Case of Prison Conditions,* 7 Am. J. Crim. Law 119, 124 (1979).

[6]For a discussion of the language and history of the Eighth Amendment and their interpretive impact, see Brief of the State of Oregon and thirty three other states in support of petitioners, *Rhodes v. Chapman* (80-332) at pp. 6-10, 15-18.

Ohio, 1977). In this case, overcrowding played no part in the ultimate constitutional conclusion.[7] The finding of cruel and unusual punishment was truly based upon the "totality of the circumstances." The district court lumped together perceived inadequacies in physical facilities, medical care, and rehabilitation services to find an aggregate constitutional violation. It did not alter its analysis with respect to conditions or services, such as inmate classification, which even it conceded were not constitutionally mandated.

Although many prison condition lawsuits decided by the lower federal courts focus primarily or exclusively on the problems of overcrowding or "double celling", *see, e.g., Capps v. Atiyeh,* 495 F. Supp. 802 (D. Or. 1980), the typical class action challenge to prison conditions encompasses a broad spectrum of issues. *See, e.g., Newman v. Alabama,* 559 F.2d 283 (5th Cir. 1977); *Battle v. Anderson,* 564 F.2d 388 (10th Cir. 1977). In the ten years since a federal court declared that the entire Arkansas prison system violated the Eighth Amendment prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment,[8] the lower federal courts have increas-

[7]Neither the district court nor the Tenth Circuit opinions mention crowding as a problem at Old Max. The record demonstrates that it is not. Even one of the plaintiffs' experts freely admitted that "overcrowding is not one of the questions here." (R. Vol. 21 at 59).

[8]The protracted litigation involving the Arkansas prison system is found in the following cases:

Talley v. Stephens, 247 F. Supp. 683 (E.D. Ark. 1965); *Jackson v. Bishop,* 268 F. Supp. 804 (E.D. Ark. 1967), *vacated,* 404 F.2d 571 (8th Cir. 1968);

(Continued on following page)

ingly relied upon the holistic "Totality of the Circumstances" approach. *See, e.g., Johnson v. Levine,* 588 F.2d 1378 (4th Cir. 1978); *Williams v. Edwards,* 547 F.2d 1206 (5th Cir. 1977); *French v. Hayne,* 547 F.2d 994 (7th Cir. 1976); *Sweet v. South Carolina Dept. of Corrections,* 529 F.2d 854 (4th Cir. 1975); *Gates v. Collier,* 501 F.2d 1291 (5th Cir. 1976); *Finney v. Arkansas Bd. of Corrections,* 505 F.2d 194 (8th Cir. 1974). The formula has become so ingrained that even the court in *Rhodes* invoked it, *Chapman v. Rhodes, supra* at 1019, although the court's factual findings make it clear that the issue in that case is overcrowding. Because the scope of the issues is so much broader in this case than in *Rhodes,* it provides an appropriate vehicle for this Court to address the special problems of the "Totality" prison condition suit.

Amici submit that there is nothing inherently fallacious about the totality analysis but, in its application, it has become grossly distorted.[9] When it

---

(Continued from previous page)

Courtney v. Bishop, 409 F.2d 1185 (8th Cir. 1969); *Holt v. Sarver,* 300 F. Supp. 825 (E.D. Ark. 1969); *Holt v. Sarver,* 309 F. Supp. 362 (E.D. Ark. 1970), *aff'd,* 442 F.2d 304 (8th Cir. 1971); *Holt v. Hutto,* 363 F. Supp. 194 (E.D. Ark. 1973) *aff'd in part and reversed in part sub nom Finney v. Arkansas Bd. of Corrections,* 505 F.2d 194 (8th Cir. 1974); *Finney v. Hutto,* 410 F. Supp. 251 (E.D. Ark. 1976), *aff'd,* 548 F.2d 743 (8th Cir.1977, *aff'd.* 437 U.S. 678 (1978).

[9]In an amicus curiae brief in *Rhodes v. Chapman,* 34 states argued that a standard more closely associated with the history and language of the Eighth Amendment is, for a variety of reasons, to be favored. The *Chapman* amici advocated a standard that inquires whether the particular prison condition inflicts the requisite quality and quantity of pain. The *Chapman* amici did not undertake to identify precise criteria for the ascription of pain. However, they maintained that the pain that is most appropriately as-

(Continued on following page)

originated in the Arkansas prison cases, it was applied to conditions which plainly violated any understanding of the Eighth Amendment. Gradually, however, the formula has evolved to the point where, through it, federal courts have become "front line agencies for the consideration and resolution of the infinite variety of prisoner complaints." *Procunier v. Martinez,* 416 U.S. 396, 405 n. 9 (1973)

The totality approach has enabled the lower federal courts to "remedy" a wide range of conditions which are not, in themselves, of constitutional dimension. An analysis of the totality, including subjective impressions which cannot be measured, makes it possible for the whole to be greater than the sum of its parts. Of equal importance, the totality approach, as it is currently applied, significantly expands the intrusiveness of the remedy which a federal court feels constrained to impose.[10] The failure to identify any particular

---

(Continued from previous page)

sociated with the phrase "cruel and unusual punishment" is severe. They also contended that, at a minimum, an Eighth Amendment claim should require a showing that sharp or acute pain is being gratuitously inflicted. Whatever kind of pain is required, so long as it is consistent with the ordinary language usage of the term, it makes little sense to talk about the "totality of the circumstances" causing pain. It is difficult to construct a hypothetical in which three circumstances in the aggregate cause pain, but no one of these circumstances would do so individually. If some form of traditional analysis for the Eighth Amendment is adopted, a "totality of the circumstances" approach has no place in it.

[10] "Yet, because he used the 'totality of the conditions' approach, which bases the right to relief on a conglomeration of 11 considerations, Chief Judge Johnson was *forced* into adopting a remedy that responded to all 11 considerations—a remedy that inevitably would be far reaching. It may be ironic, nonetheless, that inmate-plaintiffs, who are

(Continued on following page)

violation of the Eighth Amendment leads to a generalized intrusion on the functioning of the state bureaucracy. The conclusion that the whole institution is unconstitutional leads to the apparent corollary that the whole institution must be remedied, or as in this case, closed and, presumably replaced. The broad remedies that seem impelled by the breadth of the constitutional standard are highly intrusive and quite unnecessary. If individual conditions comprise the offending totality, then individual conditions should be remedied; and the remedy should be tailored to achieve a constitutionally minimum set of conditions.

The Court should address these problems inherent in the class action[11] structural reform lawsuit and, if

(Continued from previous page)

unable to make out a constitutional cause of action based on any one prison condition in effect may receive the same relief as if they had made out and *succeeded* on 11 such claims; it only adds to the irony that such inmates also may be entitled to a plethora of remedies that require significantly more intensive and constitutionally less obvious forms of federal court supervision over state agencies than the remedies available under any one such claim would require." Robbins and Buser, Punitive Conditions of Prison Confinement: An Analysis of *Pugh v. Locke* and Federal Court Supervision of State Penal Administration Under the Eighth Amendment, 29 Stan. Law Review 893, 920 (1977).

The wider remedy is not, of course, "forced." Judge Johnson could have chosen, for example, to remedy a select group of conditions in order to reduce deleterious conditions to a constitutional minimum.

[11]The generalized nature of class action prison condition claims necessarily precludes analysis of the method of punishment in terms of its suitability to the criminal conduct which prompted it. An institution such as Old Max may house a variety of offenders whose criminal conduct could justifiably engender a wide range of societal responses. When an Eighth Amendment violation is held to exist in a prison condition suit, the conditions are necessarily deemed to be an unacceptable punishment for any crime. Similarly, the class action shifts the focus away from actual privations. Some, but not all, inmates may be adversely affected by an "unconstitutional" condition. Thus, the constitutional conclusion is not that cruel and unusual punishment *is* being administered but that an institution is *capable* of imposing cruel and unusual punishment.

Rhodes v. Chapman is not an appropriate case in which to do so, this case clearly is.

Lamm v. Ramos Presents an Opportunity To Review the Broadest and Most Subjective Of The Current Lower Federal Court Tests

The non-reviewable subjectivity, expansiveness and remedial intrusiveness of the Totality of the Circumstances analysis is largely attributable to the substantive Eighth Amendment standard for evaluating prison conditions with which it is linked. From the outset, most courts have evaluated overall prison conditions in terms of "the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society." *Trop v. Dulles,* 356 U.S. 86, 100-01 (1958). *See e.g., Williams v. Edwards, supra; French v. Heyne, supra.* However, the non-analytic nature of this hortatory concept has resulted in its further explication by reference to conditions deemed to "shock the conscience." *See e.g., Williams v. Edwards, supra; Sweet v. South Carolina Dept. of Corrections, supra.* It is through the application of these imponderable criteria, without reference to the concept of cruel and unusual punishment which they purport to clarify, that the Eighth Amendment has become a federally enforced correctional ideal.[12]

[12] ". . . [T]he normative criteria that emerge in complex enforcement, though not *compelled* by the eighth amendment, represent a body of 'constitutionally inspired implementing rules' that render more concrete the vague Eighth Amendment prohibition. These criteria both

(Continued on following page)

As these subjective standards have been applied to the totality of the circumstances in prison after prison, the remedial responses to perceived constitutional deficiencies have gradually become identified as independent substantive rights. Thus, for example, the minimum square footage of cell space, per inmate, recommended by the American Public Health Association or the American Correctional Association have been held to be the constitutional minimum. *Battle v. Anderson, supra,* 564 F.2d at 395; *Battle v. Anderson,* 447 F. Supp. 516, 525 (E.D. Okla. 1977). In fact, in this case, the district court specifically relied upon American Correctional Association standards in holding that 80 square feet per inmate was the constitutional minimum. (A-102). *But see, Bell v. Wolfish,* 441 U.S. 520, 544 n. 27 (1979).[13]. Thus, as one commentator has recently observed:

> ". . .[A]s these affirmative requirements have become standard, they have ceased to be merely remedial responses to wrongs independently iden-

---

(Continued from previous page)

structure judicial inquiry and facilitate 'self-regulating official behavior.' Thus, through repeated remedial efforts, courts in effect construct a legal ideal of the prison against which they measure existing institutions." Note, Complex Enforcement: Unconstitutional Prison Conditions, 94 Harv. L. Rev. 626, 645 (1981).

[13]The obvious problems associated with the resort to sociological standards as constitutional minima are beyond the scope of this brief. They are, nevertheless, central to the proper resolution of the basic issue presented. Questions regarding the admissibility of such standards without the availability of cross-examination regarding their bases, the desirability of resort sociological data as a premise for constitutional adjudication and the conversion of the Eighth Amendment into an utopian ideal ought to be addressed by this Court.

tified. Rather, they occupy an ambiguous status. While they are not constitutional rights as such, they seem to represent the criteria of legality and therefore are more than mere remedies. The proliferation of various labels — 'remedial rights,' 'emergent rights,' and 'entitlement' — reflects this ambiguity.

"Whatever the label, however, these standard features now function as the more or less essential elements — the normative criteria — of an 'adequate' prison. The substantive inquiry no longer focuses on whether actual abuses suffered by inmates shock the conscience. Instead, it focuses on the substantial *risk* of harm to which inmates are exposed. The court asks whether the prison has met its 'affirmative duty' to provide reasonable safety and adequate medical care — in short, to operate a prison 'countenanced by the Constitution.' These standard remedial features comprise the criteria of what is reasonable, and thus define with specificity the prison's affirmative duties. A failure to meet them, without more, constitutes the violation. So, for example, a staff shortage and inadequate medical records, formerly viewed as causes of wrongful conditions, become themselves 'deprivations' violative of the eighth amendment." Note, Complex Enforcement, Unconstitutional Prison Conditions, 94 Harv L Rev 626, 640 (1981). (footnotes omitted.)

The transformation of highly intrusive remedies into substantive constitutional norms has culminated in the adaptation of the Eighth Amendment standard which was first articulated by the Tenth Circuit in *Battle v. Anderson* and which has been applied in this case. In *Anderson,* the Court observed, *in dicta*:

"We are guided by the fact that the United

> States Supreme Court has not wavered in its holding that the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibiting imposition of cruel and unusual punishment is, inter alia, intended to protect and safeguard a prison inmate *from an environment where degeneration is probable and self improvement unlikely* because of the conditions existing which inflict needless suffering, whether physical or mental." 564 F.2d 388 (Emphasis added).

As the petition for writ of certiorari notes, this standard is in direct conflict with the rule first articulated by the Fifth Circuit in *Newman v. Alabama,* 559 F.2d 283, 291 (5th Cir. 1977), *cert denied,* 438 U.S. 915 (1978), which has also been adopted by the Second and Fourth Circuits. *Wolfish v. Levi,* 573 F.2d 118 (2d Cir. 1978), *rev'd in part on other grounds sub nom Bell v. Wolfish,* 441 U.S. 520 (1979); *Hite v. Leeke,* 564 F.2d 670 (4th Cir. 1977).

> "If the state furnishes its prisoners with reasonably adequate food, clothing, shelter, sanitation, medical care, and personal safety so as to avoid the imposition of cruel and unusual punishment, that ends its obligation under Amendment Eight." *Newman v. Alabama, supra,* 559 F.2d at 291.

Notwithstanding the Tenth Circuit's conclusion in this case that there is "no conflict between our decision in *Battle* and the Fifth Circuit's decision in *Newman*" (A-13), the differences in the standards and their propensity to usurp responsibility for the development of basic state correctional philosophy is obvious and

substantial. Until recently, the "degeneration" standard had not been applied outside of the Tenth Circuit. However, two of the most current district court prison cases, in Oregon and Washingtron, have expressly relied on the standard as their doctrinal basis. *Capps v. Atiyeh, supra; Hoptowit v. Ray,* — F. Supp. —— (E.D. Wash. July 22, 1980, D.C. No. 79-359).

The origin of the notion that the Eighth Amendment protects against degeneration or mandates an environment which fosters self-improvement is obscure. In *Battle v. Anderson, supra,* the Tenth Circuit cited *Estelle v. Gamble,* 429 U.S. 97 (1976) and *Gregg v. Georgia,* 428 U.S. 153 (1976) in support of its assertion that this Court "has not wavered" from such a holding. 564 F.2d at 393. Although these cases indicate that the Eighth Amendment focuses on the infliction of needless pain, they do not even remotely suggest that a nurturing environment is constitutionally required.[14]

It is generally recognized that the Eighth Amendment does not confer a right to rehabilitation. *See Newman v. Alabama, supra.* Paradoxically, the Tenth

[14] In *Newman v. Alabama,* 559 F.2d 283 (5th Cir. 1977), the United States Attorney General, appearing as Amicus Curiae, argued that states had a duty to protect against deterioration of the physical and emotional status of prisoners in their charge. 559 F.2d at 291. The court interpreted this as an argument that the state could not inflict cruel and unusual punishment "that would likely lead to such results," and then rejected the argument as thus interpreted. *Id.* The standard adopted in *Battle v. Anderson,* is essentially that which the court rejected in *Newman.* Significantly, the Attorney General appeared on behalf of the United States as Intervenor in *Battle v. Anderson.*

Circuit acknowledged as much in *Battle v. Anderson, supra,* while, at the same time, holding that prison conditions must not dilute the likelihood of self-improvement. Whatever meaning the term "cruel and unusual punishment" may have, according to society's evolving standards of decency, *see Trop v. Dulles, supra,* it should not be defined so broadly as to include any condition or circumstance which does not stimulate personal growth.

Both premises of the purported constitutional test for a finding of cruel and unusual punishment, as articulated in *Battle v. Anderson* and its progeny, are hopelessly inadequate. The first premise, that "degeneration is probable," confuses penology with gerontology. It disregards the inevitable physiology of the aging process[15] and it contains no internal limiting principle which would aid a court in distinguishing between the effect of confinement itself as a legally sanctioned deprivation of liberty and that type of confinement which is impermissible.

The second premise of the test, that "self-improvement is unlikely," is equally objectionable as a standard for constitutional jurisprudence. It singles out rehabilitation as the single formula for penology

[15] As the Fifth Circuit noted in *Newman v. Alabama, supra:*

"The mental, physical and emotional status of individuals, whether in or out of custody, do (sic) deteriorate and there is no power on earth to prevent it." 559 F.2d at 291.

despite the traditional freedom of states to choose a different correctional philosophy through their own democratic processes. It ignores the explicit statement of this Court that "the Constitution does not require that every aspect of prison discipline serve a rehabilitative purpose." *Hutto v. Finney,* 437 U.S. 678, 686 n. 8 (1978). It also flies in the face of modern research casting into question the degree to which "rehabilitation" can be achieved or coerced at all. *See, e.g.,* N. Morris, *The Future of Imprisonment,* 20-22, 35-36 (1974); A. Von Hirsch, et al, *Doing Justice* xix, 115 (1976).

Moreover, focusing on the likelihood of self-improvement fundamentally alters the fact-finding process in a prison condition case. The court must determine the adequacy of a correctional program in promoting self-improvement; a determination which is traditionally and properly the province of state officials. *See e.g., Procunier v. Martinez, supra.* The standard requires the court to make policy decisions as to what is, in its view, necessary to produce a correctional system which is, at least potentially, successful. However desirable such an objective be, there is no unanimity as to the means of attaining it. By constitutional decree, the district court short-circuits the political process by which "correctional philosophy" has always been forged. The state legislative and execu-

tive branches must necessarily determine the scope and direction of the correctional program in the give-and-take of the legislative process. Correctional experts are, of course, committed to the implementation of the latest programs, regardless of their cost. The legislature, on the other hand, must balance correctional needs, in light of the limited resources available, against the broad spectrum of other equally necessary state functions. Armed with a mandate to compel a nurturing environment, the federal courts would become a powerful ally to the executive. As Justice Rehnquist observed in granting a stay of the district court's injunction pending appeal in the Ninth Circuit in *Atiyeh v. Capps, supra:*

> "Naturally, penal officials would like to have a larger share of the State's budget, just as would any number of other state officials administering programs mandated by the State. But there is nothing in the Constitution that says that 'rehabilitation' is the sole permissible goal of incarceration, and we have only recently stated that retribution is equally permissible. See *Gregg v. Georgia,* 428 U.S. 153, 184, n. 30 (1976)." *Atiyeh v. Capps,* — US —— (1981, Rehnquist, J., *in chambers*) Sl. Op. at 3.

The degeneration standard is also defective because it is non-specific. Rather than focusing on articulable, quantifiable conditions which affect particular inmates, the standard turns on subjective, speculative impressions regarding the effectiveness of the

entire correctional system. Thus, for example, the court may rely on increased health risks, reduced availability of rehabilitation, reduced protection from assaults and an atmosphere of tension. It need not find that any inmate had been made ill, or excluded from a rehabilitation program, or subjected to unrestrained assault or made tense. Such specific findings are irrelevant when the inquiry is whether a system makes self-improvement unlikely because the test calls for generalized speculation rather than individual assessments. Equally important, the degeneration test is not subject to judicial proof in the same manner as are issues of historical fact. The test calls for a prediction as to future behaviors of a class of inmates which are, in the ultimate sense, unknowable. Yet disguised in the form of findings of fact, those predictions become virtually unreviewable by higher courts under normal standards of appellate review. As a consequence, the formula leaves the constitutional test for the adequacy of prison conditions subject to no understandable national norm.

In short, the test applied by the 10th Circuit is neither adequate, understandable or fair as a guide to those state legislatures and correctional officials who seek to conform their actions to constitutional standards. The basic flaw in the degeneration standard is that it assumes that the constitution mandates an

utopian ideal and forbids *any* suffering or inconvenience which is not directly related to reformation. Thus, all punishment becomes cruel and unusual. Diligent enforcement of the Eighth Amendment prohibition does not require such an inherently intrusive analysis and this Court should not endorse it.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons outlined above, the petition for writ of cetiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVE FROHNMAYER
Attorney General
JOHN R. McCULLOCH, JR.
Solicitor General
WILLIAM F. GARY
Deputy Solicitor General
JAMES E. MOUNTAIN
JAN PETER LONDAHL
Assistant Attorneys General
Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
State of Oregon

baw

APPENDIX: LIST OF THE AMICI CURIAE

State of Alaska
Wilson L. Condon
Attorney General of Alaska
Pouch KC-State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811

American Samoa
Aviata F. Fa'alevao
Attorney General of Am. Samoa
P. O. Box 7
Pago Pago, Amer. Samoa 96799

State of Arizona
Robert K. Corbin
Attorney General of Arizona
State Capitol
1700 W. Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

State of Delaware
Richard S. Gebelien
Attorney General of Delaware
820 N. French Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

State of Georgia
Arthur K. Bolton
Attorney General of Georgia
132 State Judicial Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

State of Hawaii
Tang S. Hong
Attorney General of Hawaii
State Capitol
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

State of Idaho
David H. LeRoy
Attorney General of Idaho
State House
Boise, Idaho 83720

State of Illinois
Tyrone C. Fahner
Attorney General of Illinois
160 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601

State of Indiana
Linley E. Pearson
Attorney General of Indiana
219 State House
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

State of Kansas
Robert T. Stephan
Attorney General of Kansas
2nd Floor, Kansas Judicial Cntr.
Topeka, Kansas 66612

State of Louisiana
William J. Guste, Jr.
Attorney General of Louisiana
7th Floor
2-3-4 Loyola Building
New Orleans, Louisiana 70112

State of Missouri
John Ashcroft
Attorney General of Missouri
P.O. Box 899
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

State of Nevada
Richard H. Bryan
Attorney General of Nevada
Heroes Memorial Building
Capitol Complex
Carson City, Nevada 89710

State of Nebraska
Paul L. Douglas
Attorney General of Nebraska
State Capitol
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

State of New Jersey
John J. Degnan
Attorney General of New Jersey
State House Annex, Second Floor
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

State of North Carolina
Rufus L. Edmisten
Attorney General of
North Carolina
P.O. Box 629
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

State of North Dakota
Robert O. Wefald
Attorney General of
North Dakota
State Capitol
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505

State of Ohio
William J. Brown
Attorney General of Ohio
State Office Tower
30 E. Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

State of Pennsylvania
Leroy S. Zimmerman
Attorney General of
Pennsylvania
16th Floor, Strawberry Sq.
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

State of Rhode Island
Dennis J. Roberts, II
Attorney General of Rhode Island
72 Pine Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

State of South Carolina
Daniel R. McLeod
Attorney General of
South Carolina
Wade Hampton Office Bldg.
P. O. Box 11549
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

State of South Dakota
Mark V. Meierhenry
Attorney General of
South Dakota
State Capitol
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

State of Texas
Mark White
Attorney General of Texas
Capitol Station
P. O. Box 12548
Austin, Texas, 78711

State of Washington
Ken Eikenberry
Attorney General of Washington
Temple of Justice
Olympia, Washington 98504

State of West Virginia
Chauncey H. Browning, Jr.
Attorney General of
West Virginia
State Capitol
Charleston, W. Virginia 25305

State of Wyoming
John D. Troughton
Attorney General of Wyoming
123 State Capitol
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82202

ADDENDUM:

The following states, in addition to those listed on the cover and in Appendix A, have joined in the brief.

State of Mississippi
Bill Allain
Attorney General
P. O. Box 220
Jackson, Mississippi

State of Montana
Michael T. Greely
Attorney General
State Capitol
Helena, Montana 54601

State of Wisconsin
Bronson C. LaFollette
Attorney General of Wisconsin
114 East, State Capitol
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

No. 80-1340

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

The Honorable RICHARD D. LAMM, Governor of the State of Colorado: JAMES G. RICKETTS, Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Corrections; JOHN PERKO, Director of Adult Services of the Colorado Department of Corrections; EDGAR FOX, Director of the Division of Correctional Industries of the Colorado Department of Corrections; and WILLIAM WILSON, Superintendent of the Canon Correctional Facility,

Petitioners,

vs.

FIDEL RAMOS, DAVID LEE ANDERSON, SADIKI LISIMBA AJAMU, (a/k/a Eugene Collins), ALEXANDER ROSES, MARK J. MENCHETTI, and LESTER LASENBY,

Respondents.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit

BRIEF OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER, AMICUS CURIAE

WILLIAM M. LEECH, JR.
Attorney General and Reporter
State of Tennessee

JOHN F. SOUTHWORTH, JR.
Assistant Attorney General
Counsel of Record
450 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, Tennessee 37219
(615) 741-2379

Counsel for Amicus

St. Louis Law Printing Co., Inc., 411 No. Tenth Street 63101 314-231-4477

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Interest of the Amicus Curiae	1
Argument amplifying the reasons relied on for the allowance of the Writ of Certiorari	3
I. The Court of Appeals Has Decided In This Case An Important Question Of Federal Law Which Has Not Been, But Should Be, Settled By This Court	3
II. The Court of Appeals Has Decided In This Case A Federal Question In A Way In Conflict With Applicable Decisions Of This Court	6
Conclusion	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases Cited

Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520 (1979)	3,4
Burford v. Sun Oil Company, 319 U.S. 315 (1943)	5,6
Colorado River Water Conservation District v. United States, 424 U.S. 800 (1976)	5,6,7,8
Cruz v. Beto, 405 U.S. 319 (1972)	3
Dixion v. Bradley, Nos. 80-3578, 80-3404, 80-3581, 80-3616, 80-3617 (M.D. Tenn. complaints filed Oct. 24, 1980 and Oct. 29, 1980)	2
Hutto v. Finney, 437 U.S. 678 at n. 9 (1978)	4
Johnson v. Avery, 393 U.S. 483 (1969)	3

Jones v. North Carolina Prisoners' Labor Union, Inc., 433 U.S. 119 (1977) 4

Juidice v. Vail, 430 U.S. 327 (1977) 7,8

Meachum v. Fano, 427 U.S. 215 (1976) 4

Pell v. Procunier, 417 U.S. 817 (1974) 4

Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475 (1973) 4

Procunier v. Martinez, 416 396 (1974) 5

Railroad Commission of Texas v. Pullman Company, 312 U.S. 496 (1941) 5,6

Ramos v. Lamm, No. 79-2324, Slip opinion at pp. 5-12 (10th Cir. Sept. 25, 1980) 6,7,8

Trigg v. Alexander, No. A-6047-I (Davidson County Chancery), permission to appeal granted, No. 81-2-1 (Tenn. Jan. 12, 1981) 2

Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37 (1971) 5,7

Statutes Cited

42 U.S.C. § 1983 2

Rules Cited

Sup.Ct.R. 36(4) 2

Other Authorities Cited

17 Wright, Miller, and Cooper, Federal Practice and Procedure § 4247 7

No. 80-1340

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

The Honorable RICHARD D. LAMM, Governor of the State of Colorado: JAMES G. RICKETTS, Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Corrections; JOHN PERKO, Director of Adult Services of the Colorado Department of Corrections; EDGAR FOX, Director of the Division of Correctional Industries of the Colorado Department of Corrections; and WILLIAM WILSON, Superintendent of the Canon Correctional Facility,

Petitioners,

vs.

FIDEL RAMOS, DAVID LEE ANDERSON, SADIKI LISIMBA AJAMU, (a/k/a Eugene Collins), ALEXANDER ROSES, MARK J. MENCHETTI, and LESTER LASENBY,

Respondents.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit

---

BRIEF OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER, AMICUS CURIAE

INTEREST OF THE AMICUS CURIAE

The State of Tennessee operates a system of correctional facilities. Since 1975, officials of the State of Tennessee have been invovled in "totality of conditions" class action litigation concerning conditions in its correctional facilities. This litigation, premised on federal and state constitutional provisions

and state statutory provisions, is being presecuted before the state courts of Tennessee. Presently this state case is before the Tennessee Supreme Court. *See Trigg* v. *Alexander,* No. A-6047-I (Davidson County Chancery), *permission to appeal granted,* No. 81-2-I (Tenn. Jan. 12, 1981).

During the period of this litigation, and partially in response to the issues raised in it, the State of Tennessee has undertaken a major program of reform and renovation in its prison system. The experience of Colorado described in its petition for certiorari bears a great resemblance to the process which has occurred in Tennessee. *See* pet. at pp. 2-4.

During the appellate stage of the state court litigation, the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, L. Clure Morton, Ch. J., filed and consolidated five complaints filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by state prisoners confined in one of the facilities involved in the state court litigation. *See Dixon v. Bradley,* Nos. 80-3578, 80-3404, 80-3581, 80-3616, and 80-3617 (M.D. Tenn., complaints filed Oct. 24, 1980 and Oct. 29, 1980). In his order consolidating these actions, Judge Morton characterized them as "challenging the constitutionality of conditions of confinement in the Tennessee State Penitentiary." *Dixon* v. *Bradley,* No. 80-3578 (M.D. Tenn., Oct. 24, 1980) (order directing filing in forma pauperis, consolidating cases and appointing counsel).

Given these developments, the State of Tennessee has an active interest in the outcome of the present litigation in this Court. This brief will only address the first issue (abstention) raised by the petition for certiorari. Since this brief is filed on behalf of a State sponsored by its attorney general, consent to its filing is not required. *See* Sup. Ct.R. 36(4).

ARGUMENT AMPLIFYING THE REASONS RELIED ON FOR THE ALLOWANCE OF THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI

I.

The Court Of Appeals Has Decided In This Case An Important Question Of Federal Law Which Has Not Been, But Should Be, Settled By This Court.

Over the last few years, "this Court has in several decisions considered constitutional challenges to prison conditions or practices by convicted prisoners. (cites omitted)." *Bell* v. *Wolfish,* 441 U.S. 520, 523 (1979). In the course of these decisions, this Court has shown great concern for the constitutional rights of those incarcerated in prison. At the same time, this Court has repeatedly recognized that the administration of a prison is a difficult and complex task. This Court has characterized the balancing of these propositions in the following language.

> "There is no doubt that discipline and administration of state detention facilities are state functions. They are subject to federal authority only where paramount federal constitutional or statutory rights supervene." *Johnson* v. *Avery,* 393 U.S. 483, 486 (1969).
>
> "Federal Courts sit not to supervise prisons but to enforce the constitutional rights of all "persons," including prisoners. We are not mindful that prison officials must be accorded latitude in the administration of prison affairs, and that prisoners necessarily are subject to appropriate rules and regulations." *Cruz* v. *Beto,* 405 U.S. 319, 321 (1972).
>
> "Such considerations are peculiarly within the province and professional expertise of corrections officials, and, in the absence of substantial evidence in the record to indicate that the officials have exaggerated their response to these

considerations, courts should ordinarily defer to their expert judgment in such matters." *Pell* v. *Procunier,* 417 U.S. 817, 827 (1974).

"The federal courts do not sit to supervise state prisons, the administration of which is of acute interest to the states." *Meachum* v. *Fano,* 427 U.S. 215, 229 (1976).

"Because the realities of running a penal institution are complex and difficult, we have also recognized the wide-ranging deferance to be accorded the decisions of prison administrators." *Jones* v. *North Carolina Prisoners' Labor Union, Inc.,* 433 U.S. 119, 126 (1977).

"As we explained in [cite omitted], state and local authorities have primary responsibility for curing constitutional violations." *Hutto* v. *Finney,* 437 U.S. 678, 688 at n. 9 (1978).

"Finally, as the Court of Appeals correctly acknowledged, the problems that arise in day to-day operation of a corrections facility are not susceptible of easy solutions. Prison administrators therefore should be accorded wide-ranging deference in the adoption and execution of policies and practices that in their judgment are needed to preserve internal order and discipline and to maintain institutional security. *Bell* v. *Wolfish,* 441 U.S. 520, 547 (1979).

See, also, the statement of this Court in *Preiser* v. *Rodiguez,* 411 U.S. 475, 491-492 (1973), found on pp. 6 and 7 of the petition for certiorari.

From these statements, two bases for the Court's position of restraint can be ascertained. The first is a realization of the complexities of prison administration. The second is an appreciation for the limitations imposed by federalism and comity when a federal court is involved in matters of state administration.

These two bases were perhaps most succinctly stated together in *Procunier* v. *Martinez,* 416 U.S. 396 (1974), when the Court stated the following.

> "For all of these reasons, courts are illequipped to deal with the increasingly urgent problems of prison administration and reform. Judicial recognition of that fact reflects no more than a healthy sense of realism. Moreover, where state penal instituions are involved, federal courts have a further reason for deference to the appropriate prison authorities." *Procunier* v. *Martinez,* 416 U.S. 396, 405 (1974).

During the same period of time that this Court was deciding these prison condition cases, it was also deciding a number of cases clarifying when the use of the doctrine of abstention is appropriate or necessary. *See,* e.g., *Colorado River Water Conservation District* v. *United States.* 424 U.S. 800 (1976). *See,* also, cases compiled at footnote 4 of the petition for certiorari.

A review of these cases shows that the doctrine of abstention is based upon the same two foundations [a realization of the complexity of certain matters, *see, e.g., Burford* v. *Sun Oil Company,* 319 U.S. 315 (1943), and an appreciation for the problems of comity in our federal system, *see, e.g., Younger* v. *Harris,* 401 U.S. 37 (1971), *Railroad Commission of Texas* v. *Pullman Company,* 312 U.S. 496 (1941)] as the doctrine of restraint in the prison matters. Thus, the same considerations are present when a federal court addresses a prison condition law suit as when it addresses a matter of abstention. However, except in the first amendment area[1], this Court has not addressed the relationship of these doctrines. The present case presents a reasonable vehicle for the court to address this very timely and important question. Therefore, the State of Tennessee would urge that the petition for certiorari be granted.

---

[1] *See, Procunier* v. *Martinez,* 416 U.S. 396 (1974).

II.

The Court Of Appeals Has Decided In This Case A Federal Question In A Way In Conflict With Applicable Decisions Of This Court.

The Court of Appeals discussed the doctrine of abstention at some length. However, it did so in a narrow, restricted manner that both limited conceptually the doctrine of abstention and overlooked an important aspect of this doctrine.[2]

The Court of Appeals followed the exposition of the doctrine of abstention as it was out in *Colorado River Water Conservation District* v. *United States,* 424 U.S. 800 (1976). In doing so, it addressed each of the three categories of abstention considered in Section III B of that opinion. *Ramos* v. *Lamm,* No. 79-2324, Slip opinion at pp. 5-12 (10th Cir. Sept. 25, 1980). However, in addressing only the three categories of abstention specifically mentioned in *Colorado River,* the Court of Appeals failed to give the proper breath both to the conceptual undertaking in *Colorado River* and to its precise holding.

The Court of Appeals found that abstention in this case was not proper under the "Pullman" doctrine. *See Railroad Commissioner of Texas* v. *Pullman Company,* 312 U.S. 496 (1941). *Ramos* v. *Lamm, supra* at pp. 8-9. In the same manner, it found that abstention was not proper under the "Sun Oil" line of cases. *See Burford* v. *Sun Oil Company,* 319 U.S. 315 (1943). *Ramos* v. *Lamm, supra* at pp. 9-10. Finally it determined that abstention was not proper under the "Younger" line of cases.

---

[2]It has been argued above that this Court has never addressed the proper application of the doctrine of abstention to a prison conditions law suit. This portion of the argument does not retract that assertion. Rather, the thrust of the present argument is that the Court of Appeals incorrectly applied the doctrine of abstention, irrespective of its context.

See, Younger v. *Harris,* 401 U.S. 37 (1971). *Ramos* v. *Lamm, supra,* at pp. 10-12. Having surveyed the applicability of these cases, the Court of Appeals ended its consideration.

In so doing, it overlooked both the thrust of the *Colorado River* decision and its precise holding. As to the thrust of the *Colorado River* decision, it suffices to mention that this decision and the ones from this Court that have followed it have increasingly seen abstention as an interrelated group of doctrines. Therefore, a precise classification of them and a restriction of their applicability to narrow factual situations must, of necessity, lead a court to an incorrect result in many cases. The State of Tennessee would argue that this is what has occurred in the present case.

More concretely, the Court of Appeals overlooked the precise decision in *Colorado River.* This Court in that case rejected abstention on each of the grounds listed above. However, it held that abstention in the case was proper under what has become to be known as a fourth doctrine of abstention.[3] *Colorado River* held that while, as a general rule, the pendency of a state court action is not a bar to federal court jurisdiction, there are certain exceptional circumstances in which this pendency is a bar. *Colorado River, supra.* at 817. In the present case, the Court of Appeals did not address the applicability of this sec-

---

[3]The ground of the decision in *Colorado River* has been characterized as "a fourth type of abstention", 17 Wright Miller, and Cooper, *Federal Practice and Procedure,* § 4247 at p. 502, a principal of "wise judicial administration", *Colorado River, supra* at 817, or an extension of the *Younger* line of abstention cases, cf. *Juidice* v. *Vail,* 430 U.S. 327 (1977). However characterized, this doctrine has been approved by this Court. This brief will, for purposes of simplicity, consider the doctrine one of abstention.

tion of the *Colorado River* opinion,[4] even though the Court of Appeals did recognize that there were "pending actions in the state court with a number of similar claims, in which the plaintiff class might have intervened." *Ramos* v. *Lamm, supra,* at p. 10. According to the petition for certiorari, at least one such pending law suit was a class action in which the plaintiffs in the present case could have litigated their grievances. Petition for certiorari at p. 5, note 2.

The State of Colorado has argued, and the State of Tennessee agrees, that, given this situation, abstention was required under the aspect of the abstention doctrine described in *Juidice* v. *Vail,* 430 U.S. 327 (1977). However, at minimum, consideration should have been given by the Court of Appeals to this circumstance as bearing upon abstention under *Colorado River.* This was not done. Since this was not done, and since this case clearly seems to be one of those which might present the exceptional circumstances required for abstention under *Colorado River,* the State of Tennessee urges this Court to grant the writ of certiorari to consider this question.

---

[4]A phrase from this section of the *Colorado River* opinion was quoted in the Court of Appeals opinion. *Ramos* v. *Lamm, supra,* at p. 10. However, the context of this quote shows that the court was only considering it as bearing on the question of whether injunctive relief was being sought against the state court proceeding. Therefore, while the language is mentioned by the court, the reasoning is not.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, the State of Tennessee, amicus curiae, urges that the writ of certiorari issue to the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM M. LEECH, JR.
Attorney General and Reporter
State of Tennessee

JOHN F. SOUTHWORTH, JR.
Assistant Attorney General

Counsel for Amicus

see 80

1329